OCT 8 - 1935

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

The American Historical Review

Vol. XLI · No. 1 October, 1935

ISSUED QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

RALPH VOLNEY HARLOW — The Rise and Fall of the Kansas Aid Movement 1

JEANETTE PADDOCK NICHOLS — The Position and Personalities of Silver Support in the United States Senate 26

THOMAS A. BAILEY — The Sinking of the *Lusitania* 54

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS—Charles A. Beard, That Noble Dream; Raymond C. Allen, An Effort to Identify John White 74

DOCUMENTS—[illegible] Papers, contributed by Lawrence Kinnaird 92

REVIEWS OF BOOKS—*Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, XIV, XV; Allen, *Opus epistolarum Erasmi*, VIII; Wahl, *Quellen zur deutschen Politik Österreichs, 1859-1866*, I; Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College*; French, *The First Year of the American Revolution*; Smith, *The Social Ideas of American Educators*; Barnes and Dimond, *Field and Grinkle Letters*; Freeman, *R. E. Lee*, III, IV 113

(For a complete list of contents, see inside of the cover.)

HISTORICAL NEWS 202

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

[illegible]

[illegible], NEW YORK

[illegible]

BOARD OF EDITORS

TENNEY FRANK — J. FRED RIPPY
DUMAS MALONE — CHARLES SEYMOUR
NELLIE NEILSON — JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

AND

HENRY E. BOURNE
Managing Editor

Editorial Assistant
ELEANOR D. SMITH

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF GENERAL, ANCIENT, AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY — PAGE

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, XIV, XV, by R. H. Gabriel 113
Becker, *Everyman His Own Historian*, by Merle Curti 116
Seton-Watson, *A History of the Roumanians*, by T. W. Riker 118
McDowell, *Objects from Seleucia*, by C. Bradford Welles 119
Doren, *Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, I, by Clive Day 121
Frauenholz, *Das Heerwesen der germanischen Frühzeit*, by James Westfall Thompson 123
Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades*, I, II, by Frederic Duncalf 124

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

Allen, *Opus epistolarum Erasmi*, VIII, by Preserved Smith 125
Brown, *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth Century France*, by Howard Robinson 128
Haller, *Tracts on Liberty*, by David Harris Willson 129
Calendar of Treasury Books: Introduction to Volumes XI-XVII, by F. C. Dietz 131
Harsin, *John Law: Oeuvres*, by F. L. Nussbaum 132
Van Dillen, *History of the Principal Public Banks*, by S. E. Harris 133
Söderhjelm, *Marie-Antoinette et Barnave: Correspondence*, by Carl Becker 135
Ward, *Maximilien Robespierre*, by Crane Brinton 136
Sabry, *L'empire égyptien sous Ismaïl*, by Halford L. Hoskins 137
Owen, *British Opium Policy*, by Gussie Esther Gaskill 139
Michaelis, *Die auswärtige Politik Preussens*, VIII, by Lawrence D. Steefel 140
Srbik, *Quellen zur deutschen Politik Österreichs, 1859–1866*, by Chester W. Clark 143
Cruttwell, *History of the Great War*; Hart, *History of the World War*, by T. H. Thomas 145
Minto, *India, Minto, and Morley*; *Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, 1933–1934*, I, by William Roy Smith 147

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College*, by Anson Phelps Stokes 149
Calder, *The New Haven Colony*, by J. E. Morison 151

(List of Reviews of Books continued inside back cover page)

The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW *to all its members; the Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.*

Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 6–8 North Sixth Street, Richmond, Va., or 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. The price of subscription is $5.00 a year; single numbers are sold for $1.50 (back numbers at the same rate); bound volumes may be obtained for $7.50.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW *may be sent to the Managing Editor, Henry E. Bourne, 40 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C. Books for review should be sent to the same address.*

COPYRIGHT, 1935, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Volume XLI | *October, 1935* | *Number 1*

The

American Historical Review

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE KANSAS AID MOVEMENT

On June 28, 1855, John Brown of Osawatomie attended an antislavery meeting in Syracuse, New York. The delegates assembled approved his determination to protect his rights in Kansas by armed force. Two letters from his son, John Brown, jr., were "read with such effect by Gerrit Smith as to draw tears from numerous eyes in the great collection of people present". Brown succeeded in raising sixty dollars of which the well-known philanthropist and reformer, Gerrit Smith, contributed twenty.[1] On that occasion it was much easier to draw tears than money because the troubles of the free-soilers in Kansas had gripped neither the purses nor the imagination of the Northern people. But in less than nine months after this gathering at Syracuse Northern enthusiasm for Kansas had developed to such a pitch that at a meeting in Albany, Gerrit Smith contributed three thousand dollars to help make the territory a free state. The difference in these two contributions might fairly be regarded as a measure of the growth of Northern interest in the Kansas Aid Movement.

The plan to "save" Kansas by means of organized emigration from the Northeast seems to have had its inception in the enthusiastic mind of Eli Thayer as early as March, 1854, more than two months before President Pierce signed the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Thayer was largely, perhaps entirely, responsible for the enactment of the law in Massachusetts creating the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company, the progenitor of the New England Emigrant Aid Company. This first measure became law on April 26, 1854.[2] The Kansas Aid Movement as a whole has not

[1] John Brown to his wife and children, Syracuse, June 28, 1855. Printed in F. B. Sanborn, *Life and Letters of John Brown* (Boston, 1885), pp. 193–194.

[2] The origin and early history of Eli Thayer's New England Emigrant Aid Company have been described at some length by the following writers: Samuel A. Johnson, "The Genesis of the New England Emigrant Aid Company", *New England Quarterly*, III (1930), 95–122; Robert E. Moody, "The First Year of the Emigrant Aid Company", *ibid.*, IV (1930), 148–155; Samuel A. Johnson, "The Emigrant Aid Company in Kansas", *Kansas Historical Quarterly*, I (1932), 429–441; Cora Dolbee, "The First Book on Kansas", *ibid.*, II (1933), 139–181.

been dealt with as fully as the importance of the subject would seem to demand. This paper is designed to bring out some of its significant aspects.

Thayer's project was slow in taking hold even in Massachusetts, and in its original form it did not inspire confidence in philanthropists elsewhere. To win over interested parties in New York, Thayer worked to secure the law in Connecticut passed in July, 1854, under which the Emigrant Aid Society of New York was organized.[3] This group wanted the services of Amos Lawrence of Boston as treasurer, but he declined on the ground that he was already serving in that capacity in Thayer's society in Boston.[4] During 1854 and 1855 several other Kansas aid organizations were created independently of Thayer and his friends. The first of these was the Union Emigration Society, founded in June, 1854, in Washington, D. C. Members of Congress and private citizens who resented the repeal of the Missouri Compromise planned to spread a network of Kansas aid auxiliaries throughout the free states. J. Z. Goodrich was president and Francis P. Blair was vice-president of the parent society in Washington. In July Goodrich proposed that Thayer's Massachusetts Company act as one of the suggested auxiliaries, but Thayer's associates curtly rejected this offer to step into a subordinate position.[5]

In August, 1854, a group of free-soilers in New York established the New York Kansas League with Thaddeus Hyatt as president and George Walter general superintendent. A year later it boasted of having sent about three thousand pioneers to Kansas, "nine-tenths of them respectable American citizens"; the numerical estimate at least would seem to be heavily exaggerated. Closely affiliated with the league was the American Settlement Company, formed in September, 1854, with the same George Walter as general superintendent, and Theodore Dwight as president. This group founded Council City (Burlingame). The company promised its colonists a steam sawmill, grist mill, shops, stores, and schools, all of which materialized at a much later date than the plausible printed circulars would have one believe.[6] In December, 1854, Theodore

[3] Moody, *op. cit.*, IV, 151, quoting letter, Thayer to Lawrence, June 22, 1854.

[4] A. A. Lawrence to R. N. Havens, Boston, July 27, 1854, Lawrence Letter Book, Kansas State Historical Society. Letters and papers referred to below, including the New England Emigrant Aid Papers, Barnes Papers, Thayer Papers, Higginson Papers, Hyatt Papers, and Brown Papers, are in this collection, and are manuscript material, unless otherwise indicated.

[5] Printed circular, Washington, June 29, 1854, over Goodrich's name. Copy in New England Emigrant Aid Company Papers. See also Lawrence to Thayer, July 31, 1854, and Lawrence to Goodrich, August 2, 1854, in Lawrence Letter Book.

[6] A printed circular, dated New York, August, 1855, and September, 1855, describes

Dwight proposed a working agreement with Thayer's company in Boston, but the trustees definitely declined the offer, as they had already done in the case of Goodrich's proposal.[7]

On August 21, 1854, at Oberlin, Ohio, a group of antislavery workers formed the Kansas Emigrant Aid Society of Northern Ohio for the purpose of assisting "anti-slavery men, temperance men and otherwise men of good moral character" to settle in Kansas. This group seems to have had no connection with the New England Company and there is no record of any correspondence between the two bodies. The Oberlin men sent out at least seven different companies of emigrants, ranging in size from twenty to a hundred each.[8] Next in chronological order came the German Kansas Settlement Society of Cincinnati, Ohio, formed independently of the New England Company, but anxious to get advice and information from it about making a settlement in Kansas.[9] Two more closely related and entirely ineffective aid companies were formed in New York. On May 16, 1855, the Vegetarian Kansas Emigration Company held its first meeting to plan for a settlement in Kansas. In the following February, undaunted by their previous lack of success, the promoters of the Vegetarian Company launched the Octagon Settlement Company, whose purpose was to found a city open to pioneers of good character, abstainers from liquor, although vegetarianism was not insisted upon.[10] It is difficult to tell precisely how many emigrants went to Kansas under the influence, direct or indirect, of these companies. The manuscript records of the New England Emigrant Aid Company for 1854–1855 report a total of eighteen parties containing an aggregate of 1240 settlers. The largest party numbering 173 went in March, 1855, and the smallest number, nine, left in May of the same year.[11] But the New England Company made a point of founding towns, sending out sawmills and grist mills, and providing able leadership for its parties, thereby making their settlements attractive to pioneers. The Oberlin company came next in influence; the New York settlement company founded one town; the work of the others was negligible.

both these organizations in considerably more glowing terms than the facts warranted. Copy in N. E. Emig. Aid Co. Papers.

[7] Trustees Meetings, Dec. 9, 23, 1854, *ibid.*

[8] For this information about the Oberlin association, I am indebted to Professor Robert S. Fletcher of Oberlin College, who kindly permitted me to examine his unpublished history of Oberlin.

[9] Trustees Meetings, Jan. 13, 1855, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[10] For an account of these two companies, see R. Hickman, "The Vegetarian and Octagon Settlement Companies", *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, II (1933), 377–385.

[11] Meetings, *passim*, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

Eli Thayer was a curious combination of visionary and salesman, full of ideas, able to impart his enthusiasm to others, but singularly incapable of anything like executive work. The number of settlers actually sent to Kansas in 1854 stands in sharp contrast with his grandiose ideas; he had planned originally for a ten million dollar capitalization for his Aid Company. In October, 1854, Amos A. Lawrence, treasurer of the company, wrote: "It was with great reluctance that I meddled with it [the Aid Company] at all; but it was just about dying for want of concerted action and for want of money and business knowledge on the part of those who started it. Even now it is very sickly for want of funds."[12] More vigorous efforts were needed to make it a going concern.

To strengthen the Aid Company and at the same time to arouse wider interest in making Kansas a free state, Lawrence proposed to secure the backing of the clergy in New England. Three thousand of them had already signed a formal protest against the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and their facilities for creating opinion were absolutely unrivaled. If their zeal could be enlisted in behalf of the company's affairs it would be of incalculable value. At a meeting of the trustees on September 23, 1854, Lawrence submitted drafts of letters to be distributed among the clergy asking for their help. These were approved and sent, accompanied by copies of a pamphlet describing the work of the company. It may have been in preparation for this appeal to the clergy that the trustees urged their agents in charge of parties going to Kansas to avoid travel on Sunday and also "if practicable" to enforce the Maine law at the settlement.[13]

The ministers who received these circulars and pamphlets proved impervious to a merely printed appeal, so after the company was reorganized the executive committee tried more persuasive methods. At their meeting on June 9, 1855, "the expediency and practicability of pecuniarily interesting in our plans and operations the three thousand ministers . . . was considered". Thayer was instructed to call upon his neighbor and associate, the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, to prepare the draft of a circular for the clergy. A few days later Hale was invited to come to Boston and talk over the matter. The executive committee suggested that his proposed circular should be signed by a number of ministers.[14]

[12] Lawrence to Packard, Oct. 30, 1854, Lawrence Letter Book.

[13] *Ibid.* Trustees Meetings, Sept. 16, 23, Oct. 21, 1854, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[14] Exec. Com. Meetings, June 9, 18, 1855, *ibid.*

Hale was a rapid worker and the circular went out under date of July 2, 1855, with the heading: "Education, Temperance, Freedom, Religion in Kansas". In perfect frankness the document announced that "we are engaged in an effort to have all the Clergymen of New England made Life Members of the New England Emigrant Aid Company". Then it went on: "By insuring thus their cooperation in the direction of this Company, and by enlarging its funds at the period of its highest usefulness,—we are satisfied that the Christians of New England will bring to bear a stronger influence in sustaining the principle of what was last year called the 'Ministers' Memorial', than by any other means which Providence puts in their hands." In describing the work of the company, the circular continued: "We ask your particular attention to the encouragement which Divine Providence has given to its efforts." Then the clergy were informed of what the company had done for freedom, by the establishment of six towns in Kansas, and by sending out two or three thousand settlers. Not being a member of the board of directors, Hale perhaps did not know that the settlers actually sent up to July 2 numbered exactly 1216. The statement emphasized the efforts made to conduct regular church services and Sunday Schools in Kansas, and to safeguard the newly established towns from the evils of strong drink. In conclusion, the writer expressed the hope that every minister would take at least one share of stock. For those unable to contribute the requisite twenty dollars, a subscription would be started to "take shares in the name of the remaining clergymen".[15]

Among the records of the company there are two boxes containing over four hundred letters in response to the appeal. They were accompanied by contributions ranging in size from one dollar to one hundred dollars, amounting in all to $1,557.78. In many cases the requisite twenty dollars for a share of stock was enclosed. In some the ministers expressed approval of the enterprise, but said their congregations were too poor to give any money. The Reverend Horace James of Hale's own city of Worcester sent $23.37, which he got by having every person present in his church on a particular Sunday put a three-cent piece into the collection. "The result, as you may well suppose, gratifies me hugely", he wrote. In this chorus of approval there was only one sour note, sounded by the Reverend Joseph Chandler of West Brattleboro, Vermont. "Is the Company a purely Benevolent, or is it a commercial property-holding and money-making Company? Is it expected that the stock of the Company will be worth its par value, or is this matter of shares to be owned

[15] Copy in the records of the N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

by the ministers a mere *ruse* to get money?" Referring to the valuable property of the company in Kansas, he asked: "Who is to have the benefit of its property?" "There is an apparent mixture of benevolence, patriotism and speculation in this enterprise, which makes me a little suspicious."

The circular had expressed the hope that $150,000 might be raised from the clergymen. Disappointing as they were the paltry returns did not deter the executive committee from further work in the same field. Even if they were short of money, the churches and the ministers could at least spread the free-soil gospel. On September 13, 1855, the executive committee decided that "everything possible to be done" should be done to enlist the support of the ministers, and they proposed that Hale take a few months' vacation from his pastorate in order to devote his full time to lining up the churches. Hale accepted the offer and the company made a formal contract with him agreeing to reimburse him for his expenses and for the cost of supplying his pulpit during his absence.[16]

In this same month another circular prepared by Hale went out to the ministers, this time with the more modest aim of securing $60,000. "Confident that no Christian work demanded effort more than the work of peopling Kansas with men and women who were resolved to make it free", Hale and his associates asked for "the voluntary contributions of the Christian people of New England". "They did thus", the circular continued, "quite unsolicited by the Emigrant Aid Company."[17] The circular urged the congregations to raise enough money to make their respective pastors members of the company. "If, carrying out this design, three thousand ministers of New England are made members of the Emigrant Aid Company, we believe no one will ever profess any doubt as to the moral and religious direction of its operations."[18]

In December, Hale submitted his bill. The executive committee agreed to pay it, although, as L. B. Russell informed their ecclesiastical agent: "It is proper to state candidly that both Mr. Williams and Dr. Cabot thought the bill for services larger than they anticipated." Also, Mr. Russell continued in his letter to Hale, "I would suggest a question whether our speakers have not given rather *too glowing* accounts of our success in Kansas, and led the people to think the battle is already won. I believe we have suffered more from the unintentional exaggerations of

[16] Exec. Com., Sept. 29, 1855, *ibid.*

[17] In making this statement Hale, with his mind intent upon his mission, was oddly indifferent to simple truth.

[18] Copy in N. E. Emig. Aid Co. records.

sanguine persons, than from any insinuations from our enemies. . . . Our friend Mr. Thayer represents the Co.'s stock as a 'great speculation' likely to pay 'one hundred per cent and more' profit. I do not so look at it, nor I am persuaded do you, and I think it hurts our cause with the public to say so." [19]

But in spite of these and other related attempts to arouse widespread interest in the company's efforts and to secure adequate financial support, by October, 1855, the enterprise seemed dangerously close to ruin. "So far as paying our debts goes", wrote Lawrence, the treasurer, "we are a bankrupt corporation, and have been". The treasury had been without funds since the preceding spring, and the undertakings of the company's agents in Kansas had resulted in a substantial debt. On September 26, 1855, Lawrence had submitted his resignation as treasurer, but he reconsidered and stayed with the organization until May, 1857.[20] Further evidence as to the ineffectiveness of Thayer's company and of other similar organizations as emigration agents may be found in the small number of free-soilers resident in Kansas. On December 15, 1855, after a year and a half of formal effort, only 1731 votes could be mustered in favor of the free-soil Topeka constitution.[21]

It may be that a clear realization of impending failure stirred Thayer into action, or possibly a chance visit to Hartford, Connecticut, put him in touch with funds hitherto untapped in this particular cause. In any case, the moribund company suddenly acquired a new lease of life. Beginning on November 14, 1855, Thayer and his aides opened a surprisingly successful campaign to raise money. One meeting in Hartford held out the promise of $5000, and convinced him that the state of Connecticut could be made to yield $20,000. Thayer and Hale together addressed a meeting in New Haven on the following day, which netted subscriptions for $1600 worth of Aid Company stock. Back in Boston on November 17, Thayer urged that good speakers be sent to Providence, New Bedford, Fall River, and Salem to raise money. A week later Thayer was calling for still more vigorous efforts, and by December 1, he had worked out a somewhat unethical plan which would sell stock for the company—of which he was vice-president—and at the same time put money into his own pocket. On December 19, 1855, the executive committee approved this plan, in accordance with which Thayer was to

[19] Russell to Hale, Boston, Dec. 11, 1855, *ibid.*

[20] Lawrence Letter Book, Sept. 26, Oct. 3, 9, 12, 1855.

[21] James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* (1909–1919 ed.), II, 107.

act as a stock-subscription agent of the company until May 1, 1856. He would receive ten per cent of all money he collected, provided he should take in $20,000 or more. The subscriptions which he had recently secured in Connecticut were to be included as a part of the $20,000.[22] These dates are given in detail, because they show that Thayer's intensive campaign began before reports of the "Wakarusa War" in Kansas could possibly have reached New England, and also before the propaganda of the Topeka government in Kansas could have affected public opinion. The executive committee had no inkling of the hostilities in Kansas when it met on December 1, although definite reports did arrive before the next regular weekly meeting on the eighth.

All the leaders of the free-soil movement appreciated fully the propaganda value of these disturbances in Kansas. The Missourians had indulged in ill-advised activity, even from the point of view of their own interest, and the free-soilers in the territory co-operated with their Eastern friends in capitalizing the disturbance to the full. On December 9, 1855, the executive committee of the Topeka government sent five delegates east "to urge the cause of Kansas upon the people". On January 16, 1856, they sent seven more agents to visit the various states of the Union, "to ask appropriations of munitions of war and means for the defence of the citizens of Kansas. . . ." These traveling agents were instructed not to ask for direct contributions of money, but to urge the appropriation of funds to be used in defending the free-soilers "against *foreign invasion*" and in protecting their "lives and property from *lawless depredations*". They were also to urge the enrollment of persons willing to give direct military aid in the territory itself against the invasions of a "Foreign Foe".[23]

Early in January, 1856, in Boston, the executive committee of the New England Emigrant Aid Company arranged for a special meeting of stockholders to hear S. C. Pomeroy, one of their agents just back from Kansas. They also planned meetings in various parts of New England, to enable Pomeroy to report on conditions in Kansas, and to promote the sale of their stock. At the regular weekly meeting of January 12, 1856, the executive committee requested Dr. Charles Robinson, another agent, who was also serving as governor under the Topeka constitution, "to urge as many individuals as possible to address letters frequently to this

[22] Exec. Com. Meetings, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[23] Records of the Topeka Movement, Kansas State Hist. Soc., *Collections*, XIII, 148, 150.

office" for publication, "in order to make more generally known" the advantages of settling in Kansas. J. M. S. Williams, one of the committee, suggested that handbills might be prepared, for distribution on all western railroad trains.[24]

At about this time the Aid Company reprinted and circulated a speech entitled "Negro-Slavery, No Evil", delivered by B. F. Stringfellow of Missouri before the "Platte County Self-Defensive Association". Stringfellow described the company's settlers in Kansas as "Negro thieves", "not freemen, but paupers, who have sold themselves to Ely Thayer and Co., to do their master's bidding". The very presence of these abolitionists in Kansas was a danger to Missouri. "The security of our slave-property was not alone involved; our very lives were endangered. The negro-thief, the abolitionist, who induces a slave to run away, is a criminal of a far more dangerous character than the house-breaker, or the highway-robber." Stringfellow reminded his hearers that they had organized to repel these dangers. "We have also pledged ourselves to expel from our country all who shall be found proclaiming principles which tend to induce our slaves to escape." The association would, he warned, aid the slaveholders in Kansas "in expelling those who were exported to that Territory by the Abolition Aid Societies". This declaration of policy could be turned to good account against its own makers. During January and February, 1856, the New York *Tribune* gave liberal space to Southern plans for protecting the slaveholders' interests in Kansas, with particular attention to the bill then pending in the Georgia legislature for appropriating $50,000 in aid of Southern emigration to Kansas.[25] The bill did not pass, but it served its purpose as material for propaganda in the North.

It was in this highly favorable atmosphere that Thayer undertook to sell the Aid Company's stock in Brooklyn and New York. The results almost came up even to his own generous hopes. Reports which he sent to the company's office in Boston showed that with the valuable help of Henry Ward Beecher, he got subscriptions to stock in Brooklyn amounting to $21,710. At the second meeting in Brooklyn, Thayer "spoke with great energy, and brought down the house several times". One meeting in New York produced $7660 with numerous promises of more to follow.[26] In a letter to Hale, Frederick Law Olmsted wrote engagingly of Thayer's speeches, of "his magnificent plans and his hopeful enthusi-

[24] Exec. Com. Meetings, Jan. 5, 12, 19, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[25] Rhodes, II, 150–153.

[26] Exec. Com. Meetings, Jan. 19, 26, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

asm". He had already collected $40,000, Olmsted continued, and he was confidently expecting to raise $100,000.[27]

On March 8, 1856, the books of the treasurer, which up to the beginning of Thayer's intensive campaigns had shown a continuous deficit, now displayed a cash balance of $18,202.36, and at the annual meeting held on May 27, 1856, the treasury had a record of total receipts amounting to $102,243.63, and total expenditures of $96,940, leaving a cash balance of $5,287.62. Even the ordinarily pessimistic Lawrence must have permitted himself a smile at the revival of the company's fortunes.

In the meantime, representatives of the Topeka government in Kansas, official and otherwise, were at work in the Eastern states, arousing interest in Kansas and appealing for funds. John Hutchinson canvassed parts of western New York, and wrote from Utica that money could be raised there. From Binghamton, he reported on his visits to Syracuse, Utica, Albany, and Troy, with the estimate that two or three thousand dollars could be collected in these centers. Philip Schuyler reported from Ithaca that he had held meetings at Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and Rochester.[28] Schuyler also called upon Gerrit Smith at Peterboro, and collected $100—five times as much as John Brown got the preceding June—for the redemption of "Kansas script", the paper money issued by the Topeka government.[29] The people were rapidly learning about Kansas, and their sympathies were being profoundly stirred against the proslavery Missourians. Thanks to the combined efforts of Eli Thayer, Horace Greeley and his *Tribune,* the Missourians, and the Topeka government, a situation developed which made possible an extraordinary, though short-lived expansion of the Kansas aid movement.

By February 15, 1856, Thayer was writing somewhat cryptically about a "new mode of warfare", and the possibility of striking "a heavy blow for freedom".[30] If it is fair to interpret this letter in the light of developments of the next month, he had in mind the formation of new agencies for the relief of Kansas. In any case, such agencies soon appeared. On February 18, 1856, a meeting of some citizens of Albany, held at the capitol, appointed a committee of ten to devise a plan for the relief of Kansas. This committee arranged for an impressive public meeting on

[27] Olmsted to Hale, New York, Jan. 17, 1856, *ibid.*

[28] Exec. Com. Meetings, Jan. 26, Feb. 2, 1856, with summaries of the letters received, *ibid.*

[29] The receipt which Schuyler gave, dated Peterboro, Feb. 6, 1856, is in the Smith MSS., Syracuse University Library.

[30] Letter to Hale, New York, Feb. 15, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

March 13, "to concert such measures as may be deemed expedient for the protection of the citizens of Kansas from the ruffian incursions of the Missouri Borderers".[31] On February 20, a subscription list was started to raise money for the Kansans so that they could defend themselves "from the unjustifiable invasions and lawless incursions and attacks of the Missouri Borderers upon their lives and liberty". This list contains forty-six separate names, with a total pledged of $5073. Gerrit Smith, whose sympathies were now thoroughly aroused, pledged and paid $3000. E. C. Delavan, a wealthy temperance reformer of Albany, pledged $1000, which he never paid. The other pledges ranged from five to fifty dollars.[32]

The phraseology of the foregoing brief quotations is peculiarly suggestive of the instructions given by the Topeka government to their agents, and, as pointed out above, Hutchinson and Schuyler had both traveled over the state in January. These visits of the two Kansans seem to have been the immediate cause of the meeting in the Albany capitol. Their efforts were effectively seconded by some of the prominent men in the state. On March 1, 1856, Gerrit Smith wrote to Amos Lawrence that he had been in Albany "to stir up a feeling and call forth money in behalf of Kansas".[33] On March 3, William Barnes, the secretary of the Albany committee, wrote to Smith and formally invited him to speak at the coming meeting on March 13. On March 4, the ubiquitous Thayer reported to Barnes that he had just raised $50,000 in New York, and expressed a strong desire to speak in Albany. On the sixth, Thayer wrote at some length to Gerrit Smith, in explanation of the work of the Aid Company, which "has wrought wonders in Kansas by organized emigration. If properly sustained, it will hem in and exterminate slavery in this country". Thayer hoped to increase the investments in the stock of the company to $200,000, and he prophesied that "in a few years it will multiply itself many times".[34]

The New York State Kansas Aid meeting at Albany, thus adequately advertised in advance, was held on March 13, 1856. Its promoters planned to make a deep impression on the people of the state and elsewhere. There were a presiding officer, seven vice-presidents, and five speakers. On taking the chair Minthorn Tompkins pointed out the

[31] Printed statement of the committee, Feb. 29, 1856, Albany, copy in the Barnes Papers.

[32] The original subscription list is in the Barnes Papers.

[33] Exec. Com. Meetings, May 8, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[34] Smith MSS.; Barnes Papers.

obligation of aiding "the outraged People of Kansas", and compared this responsibility to the "holy duty in '76". At that time, he said—with an engaging disregard of truth sometimes displayed by public speakers—"When some of the Southern States were called upon for their quota of men, they said they could spare none, as they were all needed to protect their homes in the event of an insurrection of their Negroes. An institution thus paralyzing should not be permitted to find a place in the Free Territory of Kansas".[35]

Gerrit Smith had his own speech printed for distribution throughout the state. In it he paid his respects to the "unmitigated and desperate scoundrels in Missouri" who had set up an arbitrary government in Kansas in violation of the will of the majority. He regretted to hear reports that the people in Kansas thought of submitting to "this ruffian government", and he declared that they must not submit to it. "They must resist it, even if in doing so they have to resist both Congress and President. And we must stand by them in their resistance".[36] The meeting authorized Tompkins to appoint a "New York State Kansas Committee" of fifteen, to raise money for Kansas, and to encourage emigration there. Resolutions were adopted calling for help to enable the free-soilers in Kansas to resist "the insolent attempts of a foreign people to impose upon them the despotism of laws which would be a disgrace to the most savage people". The delegates present pledged themselves to help the Kansans in their contest with "the insolent slave power which has so long and so illy ruled this Republic". To make the work really effective, the convention recommended local meetings to be held in every county in the state.[37] The highly quotable phraseology of the speeches and resolutions had been carefully chosen.

This New York State Kansas Committee, with William Barnes as chairman, promptly entered into correspondence with the New England Emigrant Aid Company in Boston and worked regularly in co-operation with it. "We consider your organization as a prime necessity and indispensable to our work", Barnes wrote.[38] Barnes also authorized the opening of a branch office in New York City which co-operated with George Walter, the general superintendent of the Kansas League and the American Settlement Company.[39] It is impossible to tell from the

[35] Newspaper clipping, Barnes Papers.

[36] Copy in the New York Public Library, MSS. Division.

[37] Barnes Papers, Mar. 13, 1856.

[38] T. H. Webb to Barnes, Boston, Mar. 20, 1856, *ibid.* Barnes to Webb, Albany, Apr. 2, 1856, Barnes Letter Book.

[39] Printed circular, Apr. 18, 1856, Barnes Papers.

records of the New York State Kansas Committee how many emigrants went to the territory under its auspices, but it sent at least three small groups of which there is a record, and probably two or three others.[40]

The formation of the New York State Committee at Albany was only the beginning of the new campaign to "save" Kansas. On February 23, 1856, S. C. Pomeroy wrote of a most enthusiastic meeting in Philadelphia, with "the wildest demonstrations I ever heard", accompanied by subscriptions of more than $1500 to the cause. Next came an account from Pittsburgh of the formation of "the Kansas Aid Association of Alleghany County", which planned to work in co-operation with the new England Company.[41] On March 6, following a series of local Kansas aid meetings, there was a convention in Milwaukee, which organized the "Wisconsin State Kansas Emigration Society". Charles T. Hotchkiss, the secretary, wrote to the New England Company for information and advice.[42] On May 29, 1856, a similar organization was formed in Illinois. There were others formed during this period, but not all of them corresponded with the company at Boston or with Barnes's committee at Albany.

Additional momentum was imparted to the Kansas aid movement when the proslavery groups sacked the New England Emigrant Aid Company's town of Lawrence, Kansas, May 21, 1856. In a letter printed in the Syracuse *Journal* of May 31, 1856, Gerrit Smith announced his readiness to aid a violent attack upon slavery, and pledged $10,000 to the cause. On June 7, the executive committee of the New England Emigrant Aid Company instructed Hale to write to every town in New England, asking each to send at least one emigrant to Kansas, and more if possible. On the same day in New York City, Eli Thayer was completing the plans for an important meeting in the Broadway Tabernacle, to be held on the following Monday, June 9.[43]

This meeting was directed by Thayer, Andrew H. Reeder, the former territorial governor of Kansas, and Thaddeus Hyatt of New York. First of all the assembled friends of Kansas adopted a resolution calling upon President Pierce to protect "the Free State settlers from the lawless outrages of the invading Missouri mob and their auxiliaries, recently collected by Major Buford in the southern slave states". Then they de-

[40] Memorandum Book, under dates of Apr. 16, May 14, June 4, 1856, for the three parties, numbering respectively 18, 56, and approximately 20, *ibid.*

[41] Exec. Com., Mar. 1, 8, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

[42] Letter to Hale, Milwaukee, Mar. 18, 1856, *ibid.*

[43] Meeting of June 7, 1856, *ibid.* I. L. Wilde to Barnes, June 7, 1856, Barnes Papers.

clared that the free-soilers would be justified in defending themselves if other protection were not afforded. A committee of twenty-five, with Thaddeus Hyatt as chairman and secretary was appointed to collect money. By June 21 they had taken in $3,057.95. At a meeting of the committee on June 26, Eli Thayer, Andrew H. Reeder, and a member of the New York State Committee at Albany, a Mr. Pepper, were present. Reeder proposed that the committee place 5000 armed settlers in Kansas, and support them for one year. To supervise this work, and to raise the two million dollars which he thought would be needed, Reeder advocated the formation of a National Kansas Committee, with headquarters at Chicago. To reinforce the National Committee, he urged the formation of local Kansas committees in every state, county, city, and town throughout the free states. There were to be no salaried officials, he said; "the whole work to be one of unadulterated patriotism".[44] The Bostonians were equally active. On June 14, the New England Emigrant Aid Company appointed a committee to work with the "Boston Aid for Kansas Committee", of which Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe was chairman, and with similar committees elsewhere. On June 25, a convention of delegates from various towns, meeting in Boston, organized a "State Kansas Aid Committee", of which George L. Stearns was president and leading spirit. These new aid committees planned to furnish direct financial help to individuals going to Kansas.[45] On June 20, a convention of delegates from the organized Kansas aid groups met in Cleveland, to carry through Reeder's proposal for a national Kansas committee. For various reasons, the delegates postponed action, and called for another convention at Buffalo on July 9, 1856.

In many respects this Buffalo convention marked the climax of the Kansas aid movement. Preparations were made for co-ordinating the work of the scattered, unrelated groups, and for putting the control of all funds and expenditures into the hands of a central committee. There were fifty-seven delegates in attendance from twelve states and Kansas. New York sent the largest delegation, eighteen, including William Barnes, Thaddeus Hyatt, William Goodell, and Gerrit Smith. The Kansas delegation of eleven included Andrew H. Reeder, and, curiously

[44] Account of the meetings of June 9, 21, and 26, 1856, in Hyatt Papers.

[45] Exec. Com. Meetings, June 14, 1856, N. E. Emig. Aid Co. Printed circular, Boston, July 2, 1856, copy in Barnes Papers. At about the same time, a Vermont Kansas Relief Committee was organized, under the leadership of B. B. Newton, who worked under the general supervision of Barnes at Albany. Newton to Barnes, St. Albans, July 3, Aug. 8, 1856, *ibid.*

enough, Charles G. Finney of Oberlin. Massachusetts sent Eli Thayer, Dr. S. G. Howe, Thomas Russell, and George F. Hoar.[46]

Called to order by Reeder, the convention appointed a committee of thirteen, including Thayer, Hyatt, H. B. Hurd of Chicago, and Gerrit Smith, to report a plan of action for aiding Kansas. They recommended the appointment of a National Kansas Committee, to consist of one member from each state, provided suitable persons could be found, and in addition, five residents of Chicago. Chicago would be the usual place of meeting, and three would be a quorum.

Then Gerrit Smith submitted a series of resolutions, two of which provoked a lively discussion. 1. "Resolved, that armed men must be sent to Kansas to conquer the armed men, who came against her. . . ." 4. The attempt to force slavery upon Kansas must be defeated "at whatever cost", and "that too, whether the Administration shall, or shall not, continue to favor the nefarious attempt". In a speech supporting his resolutions, Smith accused the Federal government of having "identified itself with the scoundrels, who invade and tyrannize over Kansas. It is sunk and lost in Border Ruffianism. Had we a government, we should have no occasion and no right to be here. . . . When government does not exist—when government is not present—individuals and communities must do as best they can. . . . We may wield the sword, because there is no government; or rather, because through the failure of government, we obey the necessity of the case, and recognize ourselves to be the government." The effort to distinguish between the "Missouri Ruffians" and the Federal government, he characterized as an "absurd distinction" and a "disastrous inconsistency". There can be no reliance on elections to save Kansas, he continued. "You are looking to ballots, when you should be looking to bayonets; counting up voters, when you should be mustering armed and none but armed emigrants; electioneering for candidates for civil rulers, when you should be inquiring for military rulers. . . . Political action is our greatest hindrance, because it delays the only remedy for the wrongs of Kansas . . . the action of armed men. . . . If all manhood has not departed from us, we will not consent to leave our Kansas brethren to be butchered". He hoped "the Convention will pass one or both of those [resolutions] which look to the protection of Kansas by physical force, and against whatever foe, Federal troops or any other troops. If our brethren in Kansas can be protected only by the

[46] MSS. list of delegates to the Buffalo convention, July 9, 1856; endorsed, "The names on this list are *not* to be published", *ibid.*

shedding of blood, then blood must be shed." [47] It is perhaps not entirely impertinent to observe that at this time Smith was vice-president of the American Peace Society.

Not all the delegates approved Smith's bloodthirsty proposals, and several substitute resolutions were introduced. These and his were all referred to a committee of seven, of which Smith and Thayer were members. The compromise resolutions submitted by this committee included six of Smith's original list, including his fourth, but omitting the first. After the resolutions were adopted, the convention approved Smith's motion: "That we recommend to the National Committee the appointment of Eli Thayer of Mass., as General Agent to perfect the organization of the various States." Next came the call for financial contributions, and Smith responded with the pledge of $1500 per month for the duration of the "present contest".[48]

The National Kansas Committee as first appointed included the name of Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, but subsequently W. M. F. Arny was appointed in his place. The committee organized with Thaddeus Hyatt as president, Dr. S. G. Howe of Boston as general financial agent, Eli Thayer as "Agent for the Organizing of States", and Arny as "General Transportation Agent". H. B. Hurd of Chicago was secretary, and Horace White, subsequently editor of the Chicago *Tribune,* assistant secretary.[49]

The project of a Kansas Aid committee in every state, county, and town, proposed at the meetings in New York in June and approved by the Buffalo convention, proved impossible of realization. Thayer himself, the chief organizer, made no effort whatever outside of New England and New York. First of all he complained because the newly appointed National Committee was so slow in giving him a formal appointment; this delay was disastrous, he said. "I have begun to organize New England upon the authority simply of the recommendation of the Convention. I have done much less than I should have done if appointed by the committee. Six states could now have been organized and making remittances." [50] A few days later he wrote William Barnes that he had six hundred solicitors for Kansas in Worcester County, all working without pay. Thayer's authorization from the

[47] Printed copies of this speech of July 10, 1856, in the Kansas State Historical Society, and in the New York Public Library, MSS. Division.

[48] Printed *Report of the Proceedings of the Buffalo Convention,* July 9, 1856, copy in the Barnes Papers.

[49] *Ibid.* Printed letters, over Arny's name, 1856, Barnes Papers.

[50] Thayer to Smith, Worcester, July 22, 1856, Smith MSS.

National Committee was sent on August 1, by telegram and letter. He was advised to co-operate with the leaders in states where organization work was already in progress, and to avoid clashes with those whose ideas differed from his. Thayer immediately wrote to Barnes, promising to leave the organization of New York to Barnes's "excellent committee", but at the same time suggesting that Barnes increase his organization by adding one representative from every county.[51]

Actually, the creation of the National Committee did little either to extend the range of Kansas aid work, or to centralize it, or to bring about effective co-ordination of the scattered aid committees already in existence. Wherever there was increased activity, as in Massachusetts, the cause may be attributed more logically to groups already functioning. Stearns of the Massachusetts Kansas Aid Committee, created before the Buffalo convention, was trying to complete the organization of Massachusetts before November.[52] Then the "Central County Kansas Committee" of Onondaga County, New York, was appointed at a meeting held in Syracuse on July 4, 1856. It urged the formation of town committees, without specific reference to the National Committee. Again in September Barnes appointed agents to organize Seneca and Albany counties.[53] But while Barnes was working from Albany, Thaddeus Hyatt, president of the National Committee, tried to build up county organizations with no reference whatever to Barnes's group.[54]

The correspondence of these friends of Kansas reveals the width of the gap between hopes and actual performance. Thayer received full authorization to proceed at once on August 1. Barnes, Hyatt, and Stearns were all busy at organizing New York and Massachusetts during the fall. But on November 14, 1856, Hurd, secretary of the National Committee, wrote Thayer that the great thing still to be done was the development of a thorough organization. To achieve this end, the National Committee agreed to pay Thayer five dollars a day and his expenses if he would devote full time to the work. Hurd added that the state committees, with the exception of Stearns's in Massachusetts, were more of a hindrance than a help.[55] This is the last reference to

[51] Thayer to Barnes, July 26, Aug. 1, 1856, Barnes Papers. H. [illegible] Hurd to Thayer, Chicago, Aug. 1, 1856, Thayer Papers.

[52] F. B. Sanborn to T. W. Higginson, Concord, Sept. 19, 1856, Higginson Papers.

[53] Printed circular, Syracuse, Aug. 7, 1856, Barnes Papers. New York State Kansas Aid Com., Sept. 16, 1856, *ibid.*

[54] Hyatt to the National Committee, New York, Sept. 28, Oct. 5, 1856; also H. D. Northrup to Hyatt, Syracuse, Sept. 26; Arthur Holmes to Hyatt, McGrawville, New York, Sept. 29, 1856; C. I. H. Nichols to Hyatt, Elmira, Oct. 4, 1856, Hyatt Papers.

[55] Papers of the N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

the organization of a network of committees which the writer has been able to find.

If the amount of money raised by these groups may be taken as an index to their effectiveness, the results were disappointing. For the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee, Thomas Wentworth Higginson reported that for the second half of 1856 he collected $2,646.25. Hurd of the National Committee acknowledged receipts from New York from July 29 to December 27, 1856, of $26,735.43. Of this total, Gerrit Smith gave $7000. Barnes's state committee at Albany does not seem to have handled more than $5500 throughout its existence. On September 20, 1856, Arny wrote Hyatt that during the preceding three weeks, the National Committee had sent $26,000 to Kansas, but not all of it was in money; a substantial portion was in the form of arms, clothing, and provisions. In comparison it is worth noting that for the year ending May 26, 1857, the New England Emigrant Aid Company reported receipts of $42,557.66, with a cash balance of $10,365.17. The company was free from debt,[56] and Lawrence, the treasurer, felt that he could resign with a clear conscience. Probably the Aid Company profited somewhat from the widespread agitation during the greater part of 1856; in any case, it was without question the most successful of all the Kansas aid organizations.

Before the complete collapse of the project for saving Kansas through the agency of an integrated system of committees extending throughout the free states, the friends of the heavily advertised territory were at work on a new plan. They would induce the free state governments to intervene in the affairs of Kansas and by so doing offset the pernicious proslavery policy of the Pierce administration. In the attemped execution of this part of the Kansas aid program, there were two related movements. One aimed at peaceful protest and financial help, with Amos Lawrence as the most active leader; the other called for the creation of state military forces, to be used against the Federal troops in Kansas. The Reverend Thomas Wentworth Higginson was the most conspicuous proponent of this policy, but for most of his plans he had the cordial written endorsement of Gerrit Smith. In his advocacy of

[56] Statement of Higginson covering the period from July 29, 1856, to Jan. 30, 1857, Higginson Papers. Report, Hurd to Barnes, Barnes Papers. In writing to Thayer, Nov. 14, 1856, Hurd said the New York Committee had sent very little money. Statements of Barnes, Sept. 20, 1856, and C. P. Williams, Aug. 13, 1856, *ibid.* Arny to Hyatt, Chicago, Sept. 20, 1856, Hyatt Papers. There is no way of determining how much money the National Committee handled, because the records and most of the correspondence were lost in the Chicago fire. Annual meeting, May 26, 1857, N. E. Emig. Aid Co.

the more peaceful part of this proposal for state intervention, Lawrence suggested an appropriation by the legislature of Massachusetts, to be spent by the governor for prosecuting claims of "our citizens" in the courts of Missouri. He also suggested appropriations of not less than $1,000,000 by each state, to be used for protecting emigrants on their way to Kansas. A few days later Lawrence was considering the possibility of a joint protest of free state governors against the failure of the Federal authorities to safeguard the pioneers in Kansas. In co-operation with Judge Richard Fletcher, brother of Governor Ryland Fletcher of Vermont, he put this last proposal in definite form.[57] On November 1, Higginson advocated a joint protest of the free state governors, but he coupled with his proposal an elaborate plan for military interference.[58] In one form or another these proposals for state interference were laid before the governors of Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, and possibly Michigan.[59]

Among the leading advocates of state action, in addition to Lawrence, Higginson, and Gerrit Smith, were Charles H. Webb, the secretary of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, George L. Stearns, Dr. S. G. Howe, and F. B. Sanborn of the Massachusetts Kansas Committee, M. F. Conway and A. H. Reeder of Kansas, H. B. Hurd, secretary of the National Kansas Committee at Chicago, and Eli Thayer, in other words the more active and energetic workers for Kansas in the East.

Some of the definite steps taken in this practically fruitless effort can be easily traced. On September 2, 1856, Lawrence asked for an appointment with Governor Gardner of Massachusetts to talk about state intervention, and to inform him what other state executives had done. On September 8, Webb wrote to Hyatt of a conference of several friends of Kansas, with the result that committees were at work in every town in Massachusetts, securing signatures to petitions to the governor for an extra session, to devise means for the relief of emigrants from Massachusetts in Kansas. On October 26, Higginson wrote that he had addressed the Vermont legislature, and had talked with Governor Fletcher, "who will, I think, go farther than Governor Grimes [of Iowa], when needed, and who wishes for some conference between the different executives.[60]

[57]Lawrence to E. Rockwood Hoar, Boston, Sept. 5, 1856; Lawrence to Governor Gardner, Boston, Sept. 12, 1856; Lawrence to Gov. Charles Robinson, Boston, Sept. 16, 1856, Lawrence Letter Book.

[58] Higginson to Smith, Worcester, Nov. 1, 1856, Smith MSS.

[59] Lawrence Letter Book, Sept. 2, 4, 1856; Reeder to Hyatt [?], Easton, Pa., Sept. 7, 1856, Hyatt Papers.

[60]Lawrence to Gov. Gardner, Boston, Sept. 2, Lawrence Letter Book; Webb to Hyatt, Boston, Sept. 8, Hyatt Papers; Higginson to Hyatt, Worcester, Oct. 26, *ibid.*

Early in November, M. F. Conway left Boston for Vermont, under the auspices of the Massachusetts State Kansas Aid Committee, to stay as long as necessary to accomplish the purpose he had in mind.[61] On arriving at Montpelier, Conway found that a bill appropriating $20,000 for the relief of Kansas had been dropped, and in its place, the legislature was considering an appropriation of only $5000. Conway received permission to address the House, and he proceeded to work upon Governor Fletcher, who was "befooled and befogged by every body who comes along". The Kansas men had made a mistake, he wrote, in not sending a good man to Montpelier at the start, to see the project through. But Conway himself must have been an efficient worker, because after four days, he wrote Higginson: "I got a bill through the House of Representatives of the Vermont Legislature for $20,000 by a vote of 124 to 69".[62] The measure became law, but it was so worded that the money could be used only for furnishing food and clothing to needy Vermonters in Kansas. It was absolutely silent on Higginson's proposal for military intervention.[63]

In Massachusetts, a bill was introduced, supported by petitions from all parts of the state, which were circulated by the Massachusetts Kansas Aid Committee.[64] In December and January, however, Lawrence thought the emergency was over, and he opposed the project. By March, 1857, with changes in Kansas, Lawrence again came to favor state intervention, but his previous opposition settled the fate of the policy, and nothing was done. Lawrence was always conservative and generally levelheaded. When he advocated state aid, he meant peaceful help, limited to financial contributions and resolutions. Furthermore, as far as the Kansans themselves were concerned, he felt that they were entirely justified in defending themselves against attack, and he contributed a thousand dollars of his own money to provide them with rifles to use against "the Missouri outlaws". But he consistently warned his friends in Kansas to refrain from resisting or attacking the Federal authorities.[65]

Thomas Wentworth Higginson and Gerrit Smith, on the other hand,

[61] G. L. Stearns to Higginson, Boston, Nov. 8, 1856, Higginson Papers.

[62] Conway to Higginson, Montpelier, Nov. 12, 13, 17, 1856, *ibid.*

[63] B. B. Newton to Barnes, St. Albans, Vt., Jan. 12, 1857, enclosing newspaper copy of the act, Barnes Papers.

[64] Sanborn to Higginson, Boston, Dec. 27, 1856, Higginson Papers.

[65] Lawrence to Howe, Boston, Dec. 22, and to Robinson, Dec. 26, 1856; to Gov. Gardner, Boston, Mar. 7, 1857; to Judge Hoar, Mar. 10, 1857; to Chas. H. Webb, June 12, 1855; to Robinson, Aug. 10, 16, Dec. 10, 1855, Jan. 31, 1856, Lawrence Letter Book.

indulged in highly treasonable talk, after the manner of Smith's speeches at Albany and Buffalo, described above. In October, 1856, Smith delivered another vigorous plea for violence at the celebration of the Jerry Rescue in Syracuse: "From the very first, I have plead earnestly, in both State and National Kansas Conventions and elsewhere, that the friends of Freedom in and out of Kansas should array themselves as well against the Federal troops, as against the Missouri marauders. . . . But, alas, silly and insane counsels prevailed", and it was decided not to oppose the Federal forces. "But why, in the name of reason, were we bound to have any more respect for the Federal Government than for the Border Ruffian Government. . . . Why, indeed, were we not equally bound to regard both governments as spurious, and worthy only of our execration and resistance?" [66]

The extent to which these views had permeated the more radical circle of reformers may be inferred from the following proposal, debated in "the Young Men's Lyceum" at Oberlin: "In case Buchanan should be elected the next president of the U. S., the Free States should immediately take measures to protect their citizens in Kansas, even though they should come in conflict with the general government." [67] These Easterners who worked off their resentment over the course of affairs in Kansas in mere words sometimes received encouragement from bolder spirits at the front. A semi-literate emigrant from Maine wrote Higginson: "I perpose to take about 60 or more good men well acquipped and mounted and Garrilla as long as there is a Ruffian in Kansas, my plan is not to show any quarters, and consequencely take no prisoners, but give them their own play. Do with them as they do with us. Not to meddle with quiate Famlys, but where we find them in squadds, Butcher them clean by the board." [68]

During the second half of October, 1856, the more ardent friends of Kansas tried to work out a definite plan for Eastern military intervention, to be carried through by the free state governments. Hyatt, Robinson, and Higginson met in New York, and decided to call a meeting of all the "rebels" in the Marlboro Hotel, Boston, on November 5. The correspondence which preceded this gathering gives some idea of its importance. Hyatt wanted the members of the National Committee to come on from Chicago, and the leading spirits all wanted Gerrit Smith, whose violent language was so often backed with hard cash. The

[66] Printed copy, Oct. 1, 1856, in New York State Library.

[67] Fletcher, unpublished history of Oberlin College, Oct. 21, 1856.

[68] Letter of Oct. 23, 1856, name of writer illegible, Higginson Papers.

Peterboro reformer, however, did not attend, but he gave unqualified approval to Higginson's radical proposals.[69]

The Boston meeting, though small, included many of the outstanding leaders in the Kansas aid enterprise: Robinson, Reeder, and Conway, representing Kansas itself; Eli Thayer; Williams, Amos Lawrence, and Webb, the executive committee of the New England Emigrant Aid Company; F. B. Sanborn, George L. Stearns, and Higginson of the Massachusetts State Kansas Committee; Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts, and a few others. The group discussed a plan of action drawn up by Robinson, and voted to recommend it to the various Kansas aid committees.

At the head of what today would be called a "six point program" stood the suggestion that the free state legislatures pass laws for setting up Kansas aid groups in the counties, districts, and towns (thereby completing the state organizations which private initiative alone had been unable to effect). Next, ten thousand bona fide settlers were to be sent to Kansas at once, and ten thousand men were to be enrolled in the states, officered, drilled, armed, and made ready to rendezvous in Iowa, in readiness to march into Kansas in case of another invasion from Missouri. The free state legislatures were to be called upon for two million dollars, to defray the cost of this military operation. An additional half million was to be secured from private subscriptions, to aid destitute pioneers in Kansas. Money was also to be furnished to help the settlers buy land as it came on the market.[70]

The presence of Amos Lawrence at this meeting may account for the lack of any specific proposal for fighting the Federal troops, and because of this omission the program did not satisfy Higginson. On November 22, the belligerent clergyman submitted a more radical plan of action to Gerrit Smith. He wanted "to start a *private* organization of picked men, who shall be ready to go to Kansas in case of need, to aid the people against *any* opponent, state or federal". Smith's reply was characteristic: "I rejoice in your view of our duty to resist the foes of Kansas impartially —as you say, 'State or Federal'. Alas, how absurdly the friends of Kansas have behaved at this point!"[71] In the same connection, F. B. Sanborn

[69] Telegrams, Hyatt to Higginson, Oct. 18, 20, 1856, Higginson Papers; Letters, Hyatt to Horace White, Oct. 23, 1856; Gerrit Smith to Hyatt, Oct. 29, 1856; Geo. L. Stearns to Hyatt, Oct. 17, 1856, Hyatt Papers; Higginson to Smith, Nov. 1, 1856, Smith MSS.; Smith to Higginson, Nov. 8, 1856, Higginson Papers.

[70] MSS. endorsed, "Robinson's Plan of Action", Boston, Nov. 5, 1856, Higginson Papers.

[71] Higginson to Smith, Worcester, Nov. 22, 1856, Smith MSS. Smith's reply is dated Peterboro, Nov. 27, 1856, Higginson Papers.

reported to Higginson that a military company had been formed in Boston, and that it was increasing in numbers. Fred. May was named as drillmaster. Sanborn thought that a company might also be raised in Concord.[72]

In the letter of November 22, Higginson laid before Smith the plan to hold a convention in Worcester "which shall consider the idea of Disunion between Free and Slave States, *as a practical problem which the times are pressing on us,* and not merely as a technical scruple about the construction of the Constitution. Garrison, Phillips and others see that the time is come for such a movement, and will gladly cooperate on a common platform, with all who believe that the time is come for resisting the U. S. Government in Kansas, and sustaining such resistance everywhere else. I greatly desire such a convention". He urged Smith to attend.

In his reply of November 27, Smith showed less enthusiasm for the convention than for a civil war in Kansas. "As to disunion. My doctrine . . . is that peoples may break up and unite politically, at their pleasure. If the North and the South cannot live together harmoniously, let them separate—and that too wholly irrespective of the terms of the Fed. Constitution. But I prefer to have the South take the lead in this matter. I shall be greatly interested in the proposed meeting—tho' it is not probable that I shall attend it."

A formal call for the disunion convention to meet at Worcester on January 15, 1857, signed by eighty-nine names, explained that the promoters believed "the existing union to be a failure, as being a hopeless attempt to unite under one government two antagonistic systems of society, which diverge more widely with every year". Brief quotations from the speeches delivered in the convention itself reflect, far too dimly, the intensity of feeling displayed there. The Reverend Samuel May, jr., pastor of a church in Leicester, Massachusetts, proclaimed that "it is time, high time, and long has been time, when we should cut for ever the bloody bond which unites us to the slaveholders, slave-breeders and slave-traders of this nation, and henceforth have no part nor lot with them in the iniquity and infamy which they are determined to perpetuate". Wendell Phillips told the assembled disunionists that: "This has been a decent government in its day, but it is pregnant with momentously bad results. It has prostituted the pulpit,—it has made the people cowards, it has made slavery triumphant,—it has made literature vassal and corrupt, and it has transformed twenty millions of people into slave-catchers.

[72] Sanborn to Higginson, Concord, Nov. 22, 1856, *ibid.*

What a history!" Higginson himself, the principal leader in this movement, called for the appointment of a committee of seven to secure "the efficient propagation" of the doctrine of disunion, by means of conventions, tracts, newspapers, and formal organizations.[73]

With this outburst of torrid oratory at Worcester the Kansas aid movement practically came to an end. In writing to John Brown, Amos A. Lawrence voiced a lack of trust in the National Kansas Committee which was wholly consistent with the facts: "You may find yourself disappointed if you rely on the National Kansas Com^ee^ for any considerable am't. of money. Please to consider this as confidential and it is only my own opinion without definite knowledge of their operations. I hope they will get a great deal of money, but think they will not. The old managers have not inspired confidence, and therefore money will be hard for them to get now and hereafter."[74] By March 6, 1857, the New York State Kansas Committee at Albany was destitute of funds,[75] and its work had practically stopped the preceding month. On April 1, 1857, H. B. Hurd, secretary of the National Committee, wrote to John Brown and to William Barnes that contributions had ceased, and that unless funds were forthcoming at once, the committee would be powerless to continue its efforts.[76] By April 17, 1857, Eli Thayer had transferred his enthusiasm from Kansas to a new venture, that of colonizing Virginia with free-soilers. "Our Va. scheme is gaining strength wonderfully", he wrote to John Brown. Then he added a very significant suggestion: "You must have a home in Western Va." On August 21, 1857, Gerrit Smith complained that "Kansas seems to be left this season all on my shoulders".[77]

In the preceding May, Lawrence resigned his post as treasurer of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, declaring that the main objectives had been achieved, and that the company consequently should wind up its affairs. His advice was not followed, but the real work of the company was over. By that time the influx of farmers from the Northwest made Kansas a free-soil territory, and ended the excuse for organized emigration. By the summer of 1857, the more violent friends of Kansas,

[73] Printed pamphlet, *Proceedings of the State Disunion Convention, Jan. 15, 1857*, New York State Library.

[74] Brown Papers, Boston, Feb. 19, 1857.

[75] Record Book, Mar. 6, 1857, Barnes Papers.

[76] The letter to Brown is in the Brown Papers, and that to Barnes in the Barnes Papers.

[77] Thayer to Brown, Worcester, Apr. 17, 1857, Brown Papers; Smith to Samuel J. May, Smith MSS.

with their emotions still taut from the struggles of 1856, were interested in a new project then gradually forming in the mind of John Brown.[78]

The history of Kansas shows clearly that the emigrant aid companies and committees had practically nothing to do with making Kansas a free state. This work was done by pioneers from the Western states.[79] The most significant results of the work of these organizations, therefore, were to be found not in the territory concerned, but in the East and South. They exerted a profound and far-reaching effect on public opinion, which was reflected in the newspapers, North and South, and in the debates in Congress. In stirring up bitterness and hate the Kansas aid effort may well be looked upon as one of the potent causes of the Civil War.

RALPH VOLNEY HARLOW.

Syracuse University.

[78] The later history of the New England Emigrant Aid Company may be followed briefly in the records of the stockholders' annual meetings. Lawrence's letter of resignation, dated May 15, 1857, was accepted May 26, 1857. On February 27, 1862, the company's property in Kansas was sold at auction with the exception of its claim against the Federal government for the loss of the hotel at Lawrence. At a meeting on June 7, 1865, Edward Everett Hale proposed that the company undertake to move the large surplus of women from New England to Oregon. In 1867, the company was interested in emigration to Florida. The last meeting recorded was held on February 15, 1897.

[79] Convincing evidence on this point is furnished by W. O. Lynch, "Population Movements in relation to the Struggle for Kansas", in *Studies in American History*, inscribed to James Albert Woodburn (Bloomington, 1926), pp. 381–404.

THE POLITICS AND PERSONALITIES OF SILVER REPEAL IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

FROM early in the sixth century, B. C., when Solon's revolutionary decree—the *Seisachtheia* (which being translated means "Shaking Off of Burdens")—liberated the enslaved Athenian debtors, to the twentieth century A. D., when President Roosevelt reduced the gold content of the United States dollar, rulers and legislators, under the compulsion of their predicaments and their personalities, have manipulated the currency. The frequency with which they have devalued the monetary medium testifies to the popularity of that device for wiping out political and economic excesses.[1]

Much less popular have been efforts toward currency stabilization; so that their tremendous political costs have made their study peculiarly fascinating. Personal and political motives reacting in so intricate a field as monetary lawmaking baffle legislators and historians alike. The former often take refuge in simple nostrums while the latter labor over gross contradictions. For such reasons, the American struggle over the repeal of the so-called "Sherman Silver Purchase Act" of 1890 challenges historians. It was one of the comparatively rare cases in world history when a stand for stabilization was made against the full current of a phenomenal depression. Since the gold standard in that epoch, unlike the present, was a possession prized by all first-class commercial powers, the drain of gold from the United States through silver purchases undermined national credit. A choice had to be made—between repeal of the purchase law, and cheapening the currency. This hard political dilemma was thrust upon a special session of Congress convening on August 7, 1893.[2]

I

It was shortly before one o'clock, on the hot afternoon of August 8, that the Congress received from President Cleveland his special message demanding that the purchase of silver be stopped. If Cleveland ever had

[1] For recent impetus toward devaluation in the United States, see Jeannette P. Nichols, "Silver and the Senate in 1933", *Social Studies*, XXV, 12-18.

[2] In many discussions of monetary legislation economists fail to feel the full impact of political compulsions, while some historians and biographers clothe too many politicians in the robes of statesmen. Much of the literature on the Bland-Allison law, the Sherman silver purchase law, and the Federal Reserve Act reveals these serious difficulties.

held a seat in a legislative body he perhaps would have tempered his language and obtained repeal the more speedily; but that was foreign to his experience and his temperament. He did not realize how sensitive many in political life become to the charge of inconsistency because they cannot cultivate consistency with safety in a representative government. He boldly violated the unwritten rule for glossing over readjustments lest unkind attention be drawn to their all-governing necessities. Congressional courtesy tolerates much merely designed to "save face"; but Cleveland succeeded in making it as unpleasant as possible, even for men who intended ultimately to vote his way, to repeal that clause which most of them had had a part in passing three years before.[3]

Their "truce" measure, the limited purchase law of 1890, Cleveland told Congress was "principally chargeable" with the plight of the entire country, injuring the citizenry at home, wage earners especially, besides endangering America's place among civilized nations "of the first class". To repair the damage, he demanded that silver purchases be stopped by a law so clear as to "put beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and the ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries". Such bold phraseology made three broad implications which were anathema to the politicians: one that the United States might not be always in all respects infinitely superior to other countries; another that the welfare of the people actually had been harmed by legislators; and a third that Congress lacked the courage to be forthright.[4]

In this historic message the members of the Senate, as well as of the House, found themselves divided by the President into two classes—advocates of free coinage and "those intending to be more conservative". Whether senators who secretly prided themselves upon their responsibility to business relished this exposure of their ineptitude may be doubted. At any rate, conservatives of his own party, such as Senator David B. Hill of New York, felt that Cleveland should have been more tactful and ambiguous. His message, Hill privately complained, "contained not a word in sympathy with bimetallism—it made no suggestions for the future—and contained no plan for relief other than mere

[3] The uncompromising quality in Cleveland's temperament is made the central concept in his latest and best biography, Allan Nevins, *Grover Cleveland: a Study in Courage* (New York, 1932).

[4] Aug. 18, 1893, *Congressional Record*, 53 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 205–206. Except where otherwise specified all the *Congressional Record* citations in this article pertain to the sessions of the 53d Congress; each citation carries its date because strict chronology is imperative to understand the turn taken by events.

repeal. The last words of the message indicate that he favors a single gold standard. That last clause occasions the most debate and criticism . . . complicates repeal, and tends to make the fight one between bimetallism and monometallism, and in that respect it is unfortunate."[5]

Hill was scarcely averse to criticizing Cleveland and had ready a repeal bill of his own to show the attitude the administration should have assumed. Hill's bill repealed the purchase clause but softened the effect by vagueness. It declared first that repeal was not to be construed as an abandonment of bimetallism and second that the efforts of the government should be "steadily and safely" directed toward the policy of using both gold and silver as standard money. This, explained Hill, was "a safe bill to stand on", because it did not specify "whether independent or international bimetallism is contemplated".[6]

The silver faction—both Democratic and Republican—hated Cleveland for denouncing the pet arguments of their stock in trade, particularly for demonstrating that the result of government action, by the United States alone, on behalf of silver had been a fall, instead of a rise, in the price. Since the Sherman Act went into effect, the United States had bought considerably more than one third of the world's current production of silver, but all to no avail. Considering the psychological state of the Senate silverites (they had just been warned by silver enthusiasts meeting in conventions in Denver and Chicago to hold fast to that which was silver) it would be difficult to conceive of a message better calculated to rouse their ire and prolong their opposition.[7]

Their opposition was inspired by the happy realization that Senate precedent was all on their side. To ask a subsidy for a special interest was quite in line with well-established American tradition; and silver, as a special interest, had received a subsidy at least twice before, in the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and the Sherman law of 1890. Through fifteen years the non-silver senators had been in the habit of admitting the necessity for compromise, every time they legislated on the silver question; yet Cleveland dared deny the necessity and the Easterners pre-

[5] Hill to Manton Marble, Aug. 14, Marble MSS. The correspondence cited is of the year 1893 and is from collections in the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, unless otherwise indicated.

[6] Hill's bill was *S. 1*, introduced the same day as *H. R. 1*, the administration measure, Aug. 8, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 207.

[7] Cleveland's letters through his second term show a keen realization of the disregard in which the Senate as a whole held him, but little desire to placate its members. The commercial ratio of silver to gold was: 1876-1880, 17.9; 1886-1890, 21.1; 1891-1895, 27.1, Y. S. Leong, *Silver* (Washington, 1933), p. 5.

tended that the Westerners were asking something preposterous and should be shut off. This "unreasonableness" made the Westerners bitter.

Their resentment was well expressed by the brilliant junior Republican senator from Colorado. Edward Wolcott ironically reminded the Senate, "We are all friends of silver; the only distinction seems to be that some of us are bimetallists and the rest of the Chamber are 'by and by' metallists". His tongue took a sharper edge, because he was torn by inner conflict; his constituents were overwhelmingly for silver, his temperament and some of his legal retainerships bade him into the opposite camp, and his party had not yet determined which way it would face. For the nonce, having the electorate to encounter the next year, he was a national bimetallist like his colleague Teller, scornful of suggestions that certain economic laws could operate across the ocean. He and the other silver warriors were donning a very tough armor, ready for the fray in the Senate.[8]

II

Meanwhile, in the House of Representatives, majority leader William L. Wilson of West Virginia utilized the preponderant representation from urban and eastern communities not bound to silver, to obtain prompt obedience to the behest of his friend, the President. The House affixed its signature to unconditional repeal within twenty days, that is, by August 28. No such dispatch could be expected in the Senate, however, for the silver minority there were ready to exploit to the limit the tradition of unlimited debate. They came very near forcing upon Cleveland another "truce", instead of passing unconditional repeal. It was a narrow 'squeak' and by it hangs a tale hitherto untold—the tale of the famous eighty day filibuster.[9]

Oddly enough, and as proof that politicians are not prophets, one of Cleveland's Cabinet at the outset was quite too optimistic, overestimating senatorial concern for such matters as Treasury embarrassments. Secretary of State Gresham wrote Attorney General Lamont that he did not "look for" filibustering in either house of Congress; his later astonishment over eighty days of it may be imagined. Lamont, on the other hand, thought a compromise would be necessary. Some railroad and banking friends of the administration overestimated their influence with doubtful senators: Presidents J. J. Hill of the Great Northern, M. E. Ingalls of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rail-

[8] Wolcott in the Senate, Oct. 9, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 2330.

[9] For House action, Aug. 11-12, 14-19, 21-26, 28 and for final House votes, Aug. 28, *ibid.*, pp. 1003-1008.

way, and H. W. Cannon of the Chase National Bank all ventured predictions which fell short in two cases out of three. Yet another proof that in politics home votes outweigh finance.[10]

The Cleveland administration, face to face with the Senate, needed to do something to conciliate the silver minority in that body: and certain members of the Finance Committee assumed the duty. A fortnight after the Congress met, they copied the repeal clause of the bill pending in the House and fastened to it a pleasant sounding declaration, one hundred and forty-three words long, embodying the substance of Hill's two ideas. This masterpiece, called the Voorhees Bill because Daniel Voorhees was chairman of the committee, they promptly introduced into the Senate discussion, and as soon as the House measure came over they substituted their Voorhees Bill for it. As he frankly explained, they did this in the hope of making repeal "more acceptable" to their colleagues.[11]

Unluckily, the six members of the Finance Committee who supported the Voorhees substitute were not all of the President's party. They included only two Democrats (Voorhees of Indiana and McPherson of New Jersey) and four Republicans (Aldrich, Allison, Morrill, and Sherman, representing Rhode Island, Iowa, Vermont, and Ohio). Opposed to them and to all their works were four Democrats (Harris, J. K. Jones, Vance, and Vest, representing Tennessee, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Missouri) and one silver mineowner, ex-Republican (J. P. Jones of Nevada). These five members soon proved that their six conservative opponents on the committee had failed to coat the pill to the tastes of senatorial connoisseurs on silver. They undertook to get the support of all the cheap money protagonists, whether favoring silver

[10] Several of the more interesting of these prophecies are found in Gresham to Lamont, July 24, Lamont MSS.; Ingalls to Cleveland, May 8, and Hill to Cleveland, July 4, Cleveland MSS.; J. I. Davenport to Chandler, Aug. 18, Chandler MSS. Among the senators mentioned in this connection who failed to vote as the financiers expected were Call, Daniel, Hansbrough, Roach, and Vest.

[11] The Senate received the Wilson, or House, Bill *(H. R. 1)* on Aug. 28 and the Finance Committee reported back the Voorhees Bill *(S. 570)* as a substitute on Aug. 29, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 1009. Both bills opened with a clause ending silver purchases immediately. The Wilson Bill briefly reaffirmed the legal tender quality of silver dollars already coined, and the maintenance of the parity between gold and silver. The Voorhees substitute proclaimed the intention of the United States to continue the use and coinage of both gold and silver at a ratio secured either by international agreement or by "such safeguards of legislation" as would ensure their parity; furthermore, "the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed" to the establishment of "a safe system of bimetallism". *Ibid.*, pp. 445, 1003.

or paper, and to prevent a vote by endless talking, so that those who were pledged to unconditional repeal would have to take something less than that to stop their oratory.

III

The chances for a successful filibuster depended upon how tolerant the other members of the Senate might prove to be toward it. As it chanced, a host of hatreds then happened to be flourishing in the Senate and these played directly into the hands of the silver producers and their spokesmen the filibusters. Rivalries between sections, classes, parties, and persons were all there, ready to burrow, molelike, beneath the surface of the silver issue and erupt in curious places. They were unloosed for fullest interplay by the passage of unconditional repeal in the House, for that action relieved business concern sufficiently to lessen outside pressure on the Senate. The question arises, just what were the rivalries which were ready to run riot in this situation?

Sectional and class hatreds were ramifying throughout the nation. The Western miners, who had been thrown out of work when the silver operators decided to close their properties as propaganda against repeal, gained the sympathy of Southern and Western farmers who were badly in debt for capital lent by Eastern and Northern interests. Among the farmers and the small townspeople dependent upon their prosperity, inflation sentiment had been built up by vote-garnering gentlemen of such political groups as the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist Party, who saw and exploited the real conflict between the interests of the farmer and the city.

This was particularly true in cotton growing states, where two out of every three voters were farmers, and through the South generally. Chambers of commerce and boards of trade of such centers as Richmond, Memphis, Birmingham, Winston-Salem, and St. Louis found themselves quite unable to control the action of senators from their sections. Southern correspondents of Baltimore business houses likewise implored in vain. Daniel of Virginia, Harris of Tennessee, Morgan and Pugh of Alabama, Vance of North Carolina, and Vest and Cockrell of Missouri felt bound to reflect the inflation sentiment of their constituencies. In them and others like them there happened to be just the right combinations of personal characteristics, impending elections, and local situations which fitted them into the filibuster picture.[12]

[12] The propaganda object of the mine closing was openly avowed in the silver press and is continually mentioned in books and articles dealing with this situation. Every time

Cleveland's own Secretary of the Treasury, Carlisle, told him that if he would get Southern votes for silver repeal he must offer some form of inflation in exchange—such as repeal of the ten per cent tax upon state and private banknotes—so that paper currency might multiply. Otherwise, said Carlisle, "representatives from the South could not sustain themselves at home". To expect them to commit political suicide seemed scarcely fair, or so it seemed to divers senators who set about devising drafts of compromise amendments with which to catch Southern votes.[13]

While most of the farmer "friends of silver" came from the South, the West contributed a very important, because very vocal, quota. In the Populist areas of Nebraska, Kansas, and South Dakota there was little silver production but much demand for an increase in the volume of money; so, Allen and Peffer and Kyle, being much more truly representative of their localities than such Democratic central committees and conventions as officially endorsed repeal, spoke the language of silver in the Senate and spoke it loudly and long.[14]

Between the West and the South there were, moreover, political ties dating very far back; the latest evidence of mutual sympathy dated two years since, when Western votes helped defeat a Force bill designed to Republicanize the South. There had been no formal bargain—no indeed!—quantities of denials through the following decade attest its nonexistence; but the stubborn fact of the votes remained, undeniable. Politics being by nature an exchange of favors, silverites had excellent reasons for expecting Southerners to help them against goldbugs.[15]

But feelings more intimate and powerful than gratitude for services rendered, or sympathy for distressed constituents, made some senators oppose Cleveland's unconditional repeal. Their behavior was affected by complicated mixtures of personal and partisan feelings. This Presi-

a Southern or Western commercial group went on record for unconditional repeal the fact would be mentioned with pleasure by the New York *Times* and other papers supporting Cleveland. Only part of these groups sent petitions to Congress which found their way into the *Congressional Record*.

[13] Carlisle's suggestion came after a conversation with Speaker Crisp of Georgia. Carlisle to Cleveland, undated, Cleveland MSS. James A. Barnes, *John G. Carlisle* (New York, 1931), p. 260, cites a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Curtis to his mother, to like effect.

[14] When the filibuster by these Westerners was at its height, the papers were carrying accounts of the endorsement of Cleveland and rejection of free coinage, by the 1893 Nebraska State Democratic convention and the Kansas State Democratic committee.

[15] This historic instance of South and West co-operation occurred on Jan. 22, 1891; *Cong. Rec.* 51 Cong., 2 sess., p. 1740, and newspapers of Jan. 23, 1891.

dent who boldly demanded that they abandon inflation was no President of their making. They would have preferred, for Democratic candidate in 1892, Arthur Pue Gorman of Maryland, one of themselves who knew, understood, and catered to their political necessities, even if in the last ditch he did consort with the powers of wealth and conservatism. The man who had defeated their candidate could not be depended upon to respond to a situation as a politician ordinarily does. He was difficult to understand and must have bad, un-Democratic motives. Co-operation with him could not be exactly joyful.

Interparty jealousies also were rampant. Conservative Republican support for repeal, in the Finance Committee, in the Senate, and in the country at large, challenged Democratic pride in originality. In actual phraseology the repeal clause was very like that of a Sherman bill of the previous session; and Sherman was too human to be able to keep from mentioning that fact. This "Voorhees" bill was derided by Cockrell for having a "Mugwump" repeal clause and declaratory phrases which were mere "Democratic fringe". On Sherman's bill fourteen Democrats had been willing to draw away from the faith of Jefferson. For the rest, they were irked by the charge that their party was adopting enemy doctrine, especially since they knew that that enemy was profiting by their discomfiture. It would have been so much easier for many a Democrat to vote for unconditional repeal if the Republicans as a group had opposed it.[16]

The repeal faction of the Republicans, although they regretted the insurgency of silver brethren, rubbed their hands with satisfaction whenever they peered into the pit into which the warring Democrats had fallen. These Republicans could proclaim their own devotion to repeal, day by day, while escaping the blame for the delay in obtaining it and reaping political profits by that delay. The filibuster situation was a gift from the gods direct to them; and Senator Lodge piously hoped that divine intervention might continue until after the Massachusetts election.

Most of all, filibuster advantaged Republican protectionists. Since they were not of the party in power they could avoid the brunt of personal attack upon silverites of their own party. Toward these erring brethren they behaved so circumspectly, in the midst of all the con-

[16] Democratic support for Sherman's proposition (*S. 3423* of 52 Cong., 2 sess.), was announced to him by Governor L. P. Morton of New York, in a letter of Feb. 2, Sherman MSS.; Sherman referred proudly to his initial authorship in the Senate on Aug. 30, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 1051; for Sherman's curious record on the currency, see Jeannette Paddock Nichols, "John Sherman: a Study in Inflation", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXI, 181–194.

flicting talk of compromise, that they emerged believing, as Elkins put it, that they were "regarded rather favorably by the Silver people". They might use their advantage "to secure the help of the Silver people on the tariff".[17]

Under such circumstances, it seemed unbecoming, to some loyal Republicans, to expedite repeal unduly. Quay proposed a bargain postponement—of repeal and the tariff—to January 1, 1896. Chandler thought it better to stay away awhile from the tiresome debate in Washington, and find time to attend the World's Fair in Chicago. "The silver repeal will be passed as soon as the public good requires and it will seem all too soon when we find the democracy ramming down our throats a bill to promote fraud and violence in congressional elections, and a bill to destroy the manufacturing industries of New Hampshire." So Chandler wrote Frye of Maine, who was trying to arrange repeal pairs for absent Republicans, that eventually he would go on record for repeal but for the present he wanted to be paired for "bimetallism". Frye, oppressed by the Washington stalemate, could not quite follow Chandler's easy political philosophy. He remarked despairingly, "I shall *not* try to pair you for bimetallism, for I do not know what you mean. We are all bimetallists except a few silver lunatics and they will not pair".[18]

IV

The Senate filibuster began, technically, on August 29, 1893.[19] He was a rash man who would predict its outcome. Of course the actual conditions of filibuster did not lend themselves to serious economic discussion; and so the real plight of the unfortunates of the nation in this panic could not be presented with sufficient dispassion to carry conviction. Silver obscured more vital aspects of the depression then, just as prohibition did in 1932. In the speeches on all sides of the question there was much mental agility, a skipping among causes and effects, passing over such as did not prove a point conveniently. Curiously confused reasoning was offered by silverites, goldbugs, and straddlers, and the speeches seldom assumed the dignity of genuine debate.

Most of the talk was rightly regarded by the participants as political recitative, and few grew genuinely excited over the threats which the West directed against the East. Arguments covered familiar ground and

[17] Elkins to Chandler, Oct. 14, Chandler MSS., consulted in Concord, N. H.

[18] Chandler to Frye, Oct. 9; Frye to Chandler, Oct. 8, *ibid.*

[19] *H. R. 1* had not reached the Senate, officially, until Aug. 28, but the Voorhees Bill, *S. 570*, had been under consideration there since Aug. 18.

were not listened to with concentration. An exception was noted in the case of John Percival Jones of Nevada, one of the elder senators, sixty-four years of age, who commanded respect for his wealth, his skillful manner of presentation, and his experience of twenty years in the Senate. He was heard with a consideration not accorded William Morris Stewart, also an elder member and from Nevada, who was much more violent and bombastic, or Peffer of Kansas who was uncouth. What measure of reason Peffer's silver arguments contained was discounted by a press which often cloaked its economic opposition in the tawdry garments of personal ridicule.

The eighty days of filibuster afforded disaffected members opportunity to give notice of amendments. These were projected as bait for both compromise and publicity and usually carried inflationary features designed to please Southern or Western voters by taking the teeth out of repeal. The lanky Senator Peffer told the measure of his stride on the first of September with an amendment which went the whole way to free coinage. James Henderson Kyle of South Dakota decided he could go as far, and more than twenty other members placed themselves on record with proposals suiting their various predicaments.[20]

Some of them proved that senatorship inhibits study of finance. John Tyler Morgan of Alabama, after a senate experience of sixteen years and long devotion to an interoceanic canal on behalf of world trade, could offer an amendment showing a naïve concept of international financial practice. He proposed to restore silver to its legal status as of 1837, and to entice other nations to make United States silver dollars legal tender abroad, by reducing by twenty per cent the tariff on products from such obliging governments.[21]

Morgan and other opponents of unconditional repeal hammered ceaselessly against the resistance of the administration majority, wearing it down until it should be willing to accept compromise. As Vest pointed out, the gold men were indeed determined to stop silver purchases, but the "friends of silver" were equally determined".[22]

[20] The Library in the House of Representatives Office Building preserves a file—the only one known to be extant—of these projects, under the classification of 53 Cong., 1 sess., *House Bills, H. R. 1.*

[21] This was the first of Morgan's amendments and was introduced on Oct. 3; another, of Oct. 11, substituted for the tariff provision a requirement that as much silver as gold be coined monthly.

[22] G. G. Vest to J. R. Doolittle, Aug. 17, cited from Doolittle MSS. in Barnes, p. 276; also contained in Duane Mowry, "Letters of Carl Schurz", etc., *Missouri Historical Review*, XI, 19-20.

As September wore on and gave place to October, all the resources of banking opinion, the metropolitan press, and administration patronage had not killed the filibuster. It showed an astounding power of survival. To the contest Jones and Stewart brought from Nevada the courage, perseverance, and hardihood which had won them wealth in the Western environment and recognition as Western spokesmen in Washington. In them, and in Henry Moore Teller of Colorado (who was not wealthy) the virtues of the pioneer became capital instruments for obstruction in legislation. The pride of the Westerner in his West, now joined by the loyalty of the Southerner to his South, strengthened and embittered the contest.

While most of the filibusters were past sixty their anti-repeal energy gave the lie to their years, and they secured some youthful support—a little from Edward Oliver Wolcott of Colorado who was forty-five and much from the "rancorously juvenile" Fred Thomas Dubois of Idaho and William Vincent Allen of Nebraska who were mere infants of forty-two and forty-six, senatorially speaking. Their united exhibition of endurance awakened unwilling admiration from some other senators, regardless of repeal differences, who knew, appreciated, and in many cases sympathized with, the political predicament of the bipartisan silver-inflation coalition.[23]

V

To the delight of the coalition, after about fifty days of filibuster, their opponents, the repeal majority, gave evidence of splitting up into three groups: those led by David Bennet Hill who determined to force repeal by an amendment to the rules closing debate and permitting a vote; those led, secretly, by Arthur Pue Gorman who believed the Senate must follow precedent, and compromise on something less than unconditional repeal; and those led by Daniel Woolsey Voorhees (acting for Cleveland) who clung desperately to the hope that filibuster might be ended without either changing the rules or compromising. Necessarily, the leaders of these three bipartisan groups all bore the Democratic label,

[23] The pioneer virtues were fulsomely panegyrized by Effie Mona Mack in *William Morris Stewart*, an unpublished University of California thesis of 1930. On the other hand, the metropolitan press expended a remarkable stock of epithets upon these same ex-pioneers. Stewart's evolution on the currency was presented by him with some naïveté in *Reminiscences of William M. Stewart*, edited by George Rothwell Brown (New York, 1908); therein Stewart denied that production of silver had affected the price of it in 1893, but was certain that production of gold had "buried the silver question" in 1900; the last named event he gave as his reason for abandoning the silver party and supporting McKinley. Great insight into Stewart's personality is afforded by George D. Lyman, *Saga of the Comstock Lode* (New York, 1934).

for that party held the titular majority in the Senate at this inauspicious moment; but Hill and Voorhees had Republicans among their followers. The question resolved itself into: Would Hill, or Gorman, or Voorhees work his will on the Senate?

Hill began to urge cloture early, before it was generally agreed that the silverites had had adequate time to carve secure niches for themselves, in full view of their Western constituents. Hill was satisfied that the masses wanted silver and that it was a great issue for the future, especially in view of his presidential ambitions; but his constituent sympathies were for repeal, and his rivalry with Grover Cleveland could not be advanced by opposing him on that issue. Support and renown for his cloture proposition in the Senate, and outside, would increase in proportion as the filibuster broke down opposition to changes in the rules. His game was to count on Father Time to help him.[24]

Gorman also had to wait on Time. He knew that his economic affiliations were for repeal, but he guessed that his political fortunes were dependent upon a compromise. He was an able senator, hampered by a lack of keen moral discernments, and he dreamed of uniting the warring factions of the Democracy behind his own leadership. If this involved discrediting the man for whom he entertained political and personal antipathy—Cleveland—his advantage would be all the greater. But Baltimore business men were pressing Gorman for unconditional repeal; eighty of them made a special trip over to Washington to remind him that they thought the financial exigency precluded consideration of political possibilities. Gorman concluded he must be patient until the silver-inflation coalition had tired the Senate and proved compromise inescapable. Then he could walk on the stage and save his party from irreparable schism.[25]

The leader who could not afford to wait too long was Daniel W. Voorhees of Indiana, Senate godfather of repeal. If his bipartisan majority grew weary of opposing filibusters, its Democratic members might fall off into compromise ranks. The *Times* and *Tribune* of New York

[24] Hill stated the pros and cons rather frankly in a letter to Marble, Aug. 28, Marble MSS. Hill introduced his first cloture proposal on Sept. 21, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 1639, and won ardent praise from the New York *Times* therefore.

[25] The eighty Baltimoreans included no bankers, in deference to the current animosity for the genus. According to the New York *Times*, which was strong for cloture and unconditional repeal, they gathered that Gorman favored repeal but "did not profess to see much chance for the speedy passage of the bill". New York *Times*, Oct. 5, 6. According to the New York *Tribune*, which leaned toward compromise, Gorman thought it would be very difficult to reach any vote whatever unless a compromise recognizing silver in some way were agreed upon. New York *Tribune*, Oct. 5.

charged that Voorhees lacked the "iron" to push Hill's cloture plan; but Voorhees rightly judged that conservative opposition to changes in the rules was stubborn in both parties, quite apart from the silver issue. At the same time, a senator of sixty-six seldom wants to conduct his political warfare with casualties to his friends among the enemy. So he waited until he considered that they had been allowed adequate time to talk, and then asked them to agree on a day for voting. They were unwilling, because they knew the majority of about ten against them had not yet shrunk appreciably.

Finally, after filibuster had filled the weary weeks through September and up to the seventh day of October, Voorhees decided to risk an old-fashioned Senate showdown. On the morning of that Saturday, he announced, "in the hearing of the Senate and the country", that beginning the next Wednesday he would hold the Senate in continuous session until a vote was achieved. The minority had proved their lung power; now the Senate should see whether, in ability to keep awake, they could best the majority.[26]

So quaint a means of deciding a vital economic question cannot be justly derided, for senatorial prerogative—the place of that unit in the tri-cornered balance of our Federal government—forbids cloture. Talk as Hill might for a forced vote, the weight of Senate tradition opposed it. So, a continuous session was tried, amid all the usual concessions to human comfort at the expense of decency and dignity. It began on the eleventh; and gentlemen of sporting instincts, unsobered by thoughts of the more serious issues at stake, jovially wagered on the outcome.[27]

In this game of filibuster the rules were all against the "goldbugs" and other repealers. The rules made compulsory a call of the Senate whenever a single senator suggested the absence of a quorum, and they permitted a senator who was present to refuse to answer to his name, thus placing the burden of maintaining a quorum upon his opponents. The Senate could refuse to excuse a member from answering but could not compel him to do so. Since the Vice-President clung to the silver sympathies which had placed him on the ticket in the last election, and

[26] The New York *Times'* criticism of Voorhees on cloture continued through the first three weeks of October. For his notice to the Senate, see *Cong. Rec.*, Oct. 7, p. 2260. He was well within his rights in demanding continuous session, for the sponsors of a measure which has obtained the right of way on the floor can determine the hours at which the Senate shall convene.

[27] New York *World*, Oct. 16. The ages of the most active of the filibusters were: Allen 46, Butler 57, Carey 48, Daniel 51, Dubois 42, Harris 75, J. P. Jones 64, Kyle 39, Peffer 62, Power 54, Shoup 57, Stewart 66, Teller 63, and Wolcott 45.

the senators chosen to relieve him at the chair showed no less regard for senate traditions, the rostrum gave no help to the repeal majority. Their defeat by the minority became a foregone conclusion.[28]

Dubois taunted Voorhees with this fact: "It looks as though you were trying to convince someone outside of this Chamber of something which you already know yourselves." He, with Power of Montana and Wolcott, then proceeded to make sport of the Senate by continual quorum calls. Carey of Wyoming, Daniel of Virginia, Jones of Nevada, Kyle, Peffer, and Shoup of Idaho followed his lead, making the Senate go without slumber. These nine men deprived the unconditional repeal majority of sleep through the night of Wednesday, and the daylight hours of Thursday, and on into Thursday night. Between their quorum calls the speechmaking was furnished by young Allen of Nebraska who "spoke and spoke well" for about fourteen hours, and Stewart, who spoke almost as long "whether his voice failed him or not". Butler of South Carolina, Dubois, and Jones took turns on the floor, while Harris and Teller as parliamentarians held the silver men together. Theirs was a striking demonstration of certain men of the West and South fighting the East and its friends.[29] After nearly forty hours the majority succumbed. As the quorum calls show, the minority had subjected them to relentless torture, from eight o'clock on Wednesday evening until nearly two on Friday morning.[30]

[28] The right of a senator to be technically absent, although on the floor making quorum calls, was tested in the case of Dubois about 8 A. M., Thursday. The Senate voted 21-29 (35 not voting) that he should not be excused from voting; but he and his boldest associates went on refusing to contribute their presence to the quorum lists. *Cong. Rec.*, p. 2399, newspapers of Oct. 13.

[29] The formal account of the filibuster covers pp. 2392-2409 of the *Congressional Record*, with the speeches in the appendix; but the interesting personal details are to be found in the press of Oct. 12–14. Some of the highlights were summed up in the *Review of Reviews*, VIII (Nov., 1893), 478 ff. The New York *Times*, *Tribune*, and *World* were the sources chiefly consulted for this account.

[30]

October 11 Wednesday

8:15 P. M.	Dubois 62 x	12:00 P. M.	Dubois 56 x

October 12 Thursday

12:45 A. M.	Dubois 54	6:25	Wolcott 48
2:15	Daniel 55 x	7:13	Shoup 43 y
3:25	Dubois 50	8:03	Wolcott 48
3:50	Daniel 46 x	9:52	Peffer 43 x y
4:30	Wolcott 49	10:20	Wolcott 44 y
4:50	Kyle 47 x	10:46	Power 43 y
5:45	Dubois 46	11:30	Peffer 47 x

Then the sergeant at arms reported to the presiding officer: "In obedience to the order of the Senate 'requesting the presence of absent Senators', I have the honor to report that two are absent from the city, twelve are excused on account of sickness, four answered summons that they were too ill to attend, and nine in the Capitol made no answer, and sixteen were reported absent from their residences and could not be found." This left Voorhees one short of the necessary majority to make a quorum; he moved an adjournment. The forty-two faithful senators who had answered the forty-second roll call went home to bed, at a quarter before two o'clock on the morning of Friday the thirteenth.[31]

VI

Coercion, as applied by Voorhees, had failed. He still believed that he had the Senate, two to one, and he could write Cleveland that "the spirit here amongst our friends is excellent today"; but others thought differently. Gorman decided that his own turn to lead the Democrats now had come. For many days he had kept in the background, letting others make the open efforts for compromise, because the newspapers had drawn disconcerting attention to his activities. Matthew C. Butler of South Carolina had been doing some of his spadework, a fact illustrating anew the strange associations made by politics, for no two men ever were more opposite than Gorman and Butler in some of those respects men care about. John Sherman had done even more than Butler.[32]

12:08 P. M.	Power 43 y	6:20	Dubois 46
12:11	Jones 43 y	7:05	Power 45
12:51	Power 44 y	7:25	Shoup 43 x
1:20	Power 44 y	7:55	Power 44
1:55	Jones 43	8:20	Shoup 44 x
2:55	Power 46	9:13	Wolcott 48
3:02	Power 48	9:45	Dubois 46 y
3:25	Power 43	10:16	Wolcott 43 y
4:35	Wolcott 49	10:47	Wolcott 43 y Not obtained until 11:25
5:51	Power 47	11:58	Wolcott 43 y Not obtained until 1:06 A. M.

October 13 Friday

1:24 A. M. Wolcott 42 y Not obtained until 1:43 when Vest moved adjournment
1:45 Senate adjourned

(x means senator calling quorum answered to his name; y means sergeant at arms brought in some senators).

[31] The circumstances attending the close of the continuous session were officially recorded on pp. 2407–2409 of the *Congressional Record;* the papers of Oct. 14 and the days immediately following were full of the subject.

[32] Voorhees to Cleveland, Oct. 15, Cleveland MSS. Butler's essay into compromise-making was formally announced on Oct. 4, 5, and 6. *Cong. Rec.*, pp. 2106 ff.

Bitterly as the silver men and inflationists denounced Sherman, yet they listened when he spoke; and this Nestor of Republican finance, at threescore and ten, weary of filibuster and accustomed to compromise, had reminded the Democrats that they were numerous enough to pass a compromise, *provided* they could agree among themselves upon its terms. He had suggested as a pattern, an extension of time for silver purchases, coupled with a progressive decrease in their amount and a bond issue. When asked if such a deal would get Cleveland's signature, the political sage, but not the psychologist, replied, "I am impressed he will yield to a fair compromise. If he does not he will destroy his party, and his Administration will be broken down." Prophetic words.[33]

So spoke Sherman to a convenient newspaperman on October 4; and the "friends of silver" took the cue. Their compromise talk gained new vigor, steadily cutting into administration strength to the delight of the silver Republicans, who industriously encouraged rumors that Voorhees and Carlisle were parties to an agreement. Sherman and other conservative Republicans were cited as sympathetic and as disinclined to filibuster against any "reasonable" compromise. All efforts to quiet these rumors by denial were worse than useless. A list of twelve "compromise" Republicans was published which included eight men who actually did stand out against repeal to the last ditch. The four who did not were Chandler, Hansbrough, Lodge, and Manderson. In view of Lodge's later prominence, it is interesting to note that the New York *Times* then described him as a man "who might be a statesman and who is a highly trained politician".[34]

These rumors and others more variegated flourished before Voorhees sought his showdown; and into the midst of the continuous session, at ten o'clock at night, Harris had thrust a compromise proposition, experimentally as it were, which Gorman and other "sound money" Democrats were said to have approved. Senators made a mental note of its most striking terms, its continuance of silver purchases to a limited

[33] Sherman's interview originally appeared in the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, Oct. 5. But its actual influence was not demonstrated until Oct. 28 when Gorman read it into the official record of the Senate proceedings with bitter comments thereon; and Sherman observed in his hour of triumph that the reporter had been "rather more accurate than usual". *Ibid.*, p. 2910.

[34] Rumors of compromise crowded the papers from Oct. 4 on, and the same day often saw conflicting reports in such sources as the New York *Times*, *Tribune*, and *World*. Rumors that Carlisle was sympathetic to compromise were much more persistent than that Voorhees was weakening. The *Tribune* was more expectant of compromise than the *Times*, which published polls designed to expose and strengthen weak repealers on Oct. 6 and 7.

extent, its coinage of silver seigniorage, and its retirement of all paper money under $10 which was backed by gold or its equivalent. In a word, it aimed to put all paper money under $10 on a silver basis. Since Harris was a member of the Finance Committee his amendment seemed *ex cathedra,* a fact to which Allison of Iowa drew attention. Allison was quite right in expecting its provisions to reappear in another connection very soon.[35]

After Voorhees's defeat, Gorman emerged further into the open. It had been freely predicted that compromise must succeed where continuous session failed, and the compromise Democrats filled the next seven days with feverish efforts to fulfill the prophecy. On the Senate floor the silver senators continued to speak interminably while behind the scenes, in the cloakrooms, Gorman, Harris, and Vest labored in the Democratic vineyard, especially that part of the vineyard sloping in a southerly direction.

On the third day, Monday the sixteenth, was heard a discordant note in the harmony lute—a rumor truly portentous. The "steering committee" whose seven members with the exception of Vilas had nearly agreed to the postponement of repeal, considered sending a delegation to the Executive Mansion; but they "decided, after hearing from several friends of the President, that a visit for that purpose might not prove agreeable to the visitors". Evidently no one relished the task of broaching compromise to the unaccountable politician at the other end of the Avenue.[36]

VII

Hill, the unconditional repealer, seized this moment to advance cloture and his fortunes. He took counsel with two of the few Democrats firm for repeal, Roger Mills of Texas and John McPherson of New

[35] Harris brought in his amendment on Oct. 11, *Cong. Rec.,* p. 2406. The seigniorage which was the object of one of its provisions, and which the silver men were so anxious to coin, was the difference between the actual cost of the bullion purchased monthly and its nominal value if coined into dollars at "16 to 1". Of course the Treasury was not minting all its compulsory purchases into dollars each month. Instead, it was coining only enough silver dollars to match the amount of the paper money, "treasury notes", issued to pay for the bullion. As bullion fell in price, the government needed to issue smaller and smaller numbers of silver dollars to match the notes. This left an excess of uncoined bullion lying in the vaults steadily depreciating as the market price fell. If this seigniorage were coined as Harris suggested, it would automatically double in value by virtue of the government stamp; and the silverites thought this would help to turn the price of bullion upward. The Harris amendment also retired all national bank notes under $10, stopped the coinage of gold pieces under $10, and permitted holders of silver dollars to exchange them at the Treasury for silver certificates under $10, which were to be legal tender.

[36] New York *Times,* Oct. 17.

Jersey, and they decided it would never do to take their cloture proposition before a caucus of the Democratic party, for Vest and his compromise associates claimed they could dominate such a caucus. The open Senate was the place for them to push cloture and Hill the man to push it. On Tuesday, October 17, while the steering committee still hesitated to beard the presidential lion in his den, Hill rose in the Senate. "He wore his dark Prince Albert coat buttoned close about him" and thus impressively garbed, cited precedents and argued for a gag rule.[37]

Hill's argument attracted such attention as to encourage him in circulating his petition asking the Vice-President to rule out dilatory motions. His objective was forty-three signatures, the majority necessary to get Stevenson to act. Unluckily, he had to depend upon some Republican support. Lodge endorsed his position, a fact which moved Morgan to ridicule the two as "juveniles from Massachusetts and New York". Very quickly Hill ran against that fatal connection between silver and protection which has wrecked many a senatorial scheme. The Republicans would not risk a precedent which might kill their projected filibuster against the Democratic tariff due at the very next session. Wednesday night a group of them met at Senator McMillan's home—some newspapers said for dinner, others claimed for a caucus; but the senators themselves knew there was likely to be a little poker playing before the evening was over.[38]

Of course the reporters were left outside; one of them going home early, wrote that the "meeting" was still going on at midnight, but another stayed to question and reported that the assembled senators made an important decision—to wait patiently upon "the action of the majority". This was less than no help to Hill; he would get few Republicans to help make up his forty-three votes. Voorhees consented to offer an amended draft of Hill's resolution in the Senate, but he persisted in recessing that body each night thereafter, with the result that for lack of adjournment there was no "morning hour" in which Hill's resolution could be brought up. The "legislative day" of October 17 went on and on, and Hill was eliminated.[39]

Gorman remained. He was more fortunate, for the nonce, in his allies. He took Sherman with him for a call upon Carlisle at the Treasury Department on Monday, October 16, and Sherman came back and said in the Senate on Tuesday what he had said to the reporter two weeks

[37] Hill participated in debate intermittently, Oct. 17, *Cong. Rec.* pp. 2578-2601.

[38] New York *Times* and *World*, Oct. 18, 20, 24.

[39] Voorhees offered his amendment to Hill's resolution on Oct. 20, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 2729.

earlier, that the Democrats must settle silver among themselves. Sherman's remarks were interpreted as meaning one of two things—either the Republicans would accept such compromise as the Democrats succeeded in reaching, or Sherman had "a mysterious bill in a dark corner of his desk" which he intended to pass with the help of the silver men to give the Republicans the glory.[40]

The Democratic compromisers redoubled their efforts. They worked out in black and white the greatest common denominator of their party differences, a proposition for postponing repeal until January 1, 1895, well past the next elections. A select three, Blackburn, Cockrell, and Gray, made a historic trip to the Treasury Department on Thursday, the nineteenth. Carlisle obligingly undertook to visit Woodley, the summer Executive Mansion, for them that evening, to talk over their proposition with the President. Word came back that Cleveland would insist upon unconditional repeal; but the compromisers refused to believe he could block the majority of his party in the Senate. They busily pursued their canvassing all day Friday, reassuring administration men, insisting that the President to whom they had pledged their support for repeal would accept, if it bore their signatures, a plan for compromise. Their arguments were believed, while the denials of Hill, McPherson, and Mills were scouted or ignored.[41]

Late Friday afternoon, Gorman received a warning—which he did not heed. A protracted Cabinet meeting closed with a news release that the administration stood firm for unconditional repeal. Nevertheless, Gorman was at the Capitol by 9:30 Saturday morning, touring the Democratic side with a mysterious paper, and carrying Voorhees off to the Marble Room "where they adjourned to a sofa and conferred long and earnestly". Toward noon the Democrats began to drift across the corridor into the room of the Appropriations Committee where they signed the paper.

Great was the curiosity as to just what was contained in Senator Gorman's masterpiece; which faction did it placate, and what support would it receive? Within a few hours the first two points were pretty definitely known. The compromise stipulated that silver purchases would end October 1, 1894; that the silver purchased during the eleven months' interim should be coined, together with all the seigniorage to that date; that all paper money under $10 except silver certificates should

[40] New York *World*, Oct. 17, 18, 21. Sherman warned the Democrats anew, Oct. 17, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 2597.

[41] Carlisle's errand to Woodley was described in the New York *Times*, Oct. 20, 21.

be retired; and that, of course, there should be no bond issue. Obviously, these provisions met the demand of the cheap money inflationists, who hated national bank note issues based on government bonds payable in gold. On their behalf the compromise substituted, for the legal tender greenbacks and Treasury notes (payable in gold or in "coin", which was treated as amounting to the same thing), silver certificates which were not legal tender and represented only about sixty cents on the face value, in depreciated metal.[42]

As to just how this curiously one-sided arrangement was hit upon, the sources of information are contradictory. The negotiations had been pursued in such equivocal and nebulous fashion that they sowed thickly the seeds of misunderstanding and recrimination. Apparently, some senators supposed to be close to Carlisle, Gray of Delaware especially, understood that the Secretary of the Treasury would be willing to postpone repeal until July 1, 1894, provided his gold reserve were protected by a bond issue. Since Southern friends of silver had hoped to postpone repeal until after the elections of 1894, they had to be placated for the shortening of the time, and a dual concession resulted. Purchase should stop on October 1 but no bonds should be issued. The coinage and retirement features of the compromise would clinch the Southern vote, and make the measure as a whole a Democratic achievement. At this prospect of glory thirty-eight members of the party, with various degrees of hesitation, affixed their signatures.[43]

But six repealers remained unconvinced. Hill would not look at the compromise until Saturday afternoon and when he had seen it he refused to sign. Mills, McPherson, Mitchell, and Vilas of Wisconsin, and Caffery of Louisiana (who had burned his bridges) also remained adamant. Nor did it seem entirely certain that the repeal Republicans would let the compromise through. Aldrich gave it as his quiet opinion that he and twenty-three other Republicans were holding themselves in readiness to vote for unconditional repeal and cloture. The Populists, Irby, and also Stewart, added further doubt to the outcome. As for Cleveland and Carlisle, although the *Tribune* reporters indicated that they would agree, the gentlemen writing for the *Times* and the *World*

[42] New York *Times*, *Tribune* and *World*, Oct. 19, 21, 22, 24.

[43] The compromise in actual form was a request to Voorhees to introduce the within described bill as a substitute for that then pending. The press reports between the 22d and 27th gave various terms to the compromise and various lists of signers to it; the terms here mentioned were deduced after a careful comparison of the various descriptions. The phraseology adopted by the *Times* in retrospect indicated that all the Democrats but the six mentioned signed the paper, even if they later erased their names in some cases.

emphatically denied it. It was a dangerous situation which Gorman faced. In the morning he had intended to present the compromise at once; but in the afternoon he decided that he must wait—until Monday. The delay proved fatal.

Sunday gave time for sober second thought. Silver senators awoke: coinage of the seigniorage already in the Treasury and of the seigniorage and bullion due to come in during the next eleven months would do them scant good in enlarging their market. Furthermore, to swell the volume of silver in circulation and substitute silver for gold as the backing of all paper money, without retaining the Sherman law provision guaranteeing to silver money parity with gold, would tend to lower the price of silver bullion. This compromise was an inflationist scheme solely. As Jones told the reporters, silver men would make a "dead fight" against it. Their resentment Voorhees happily reported to Cleveland: "A great change in the sentiment of the silver men has taken place since yesterday and now begins to show itself. The silver-state men are not satisfied with the compromise that their allies on this side the Chamber propose and much prefer unconditional repeal."

Likewise those Republicans who still stood for unconditional repeal contributed to the Democratic demoralization. O. H. Platt joined Aldrich in open disapproval of the compromise. Sherman denied that he was hiding a similar bill in his desk, and even threatened to denounce the Gorman proposition, if it came up in the Senate, as a scheme less worthy than the much reviled law which bore his own name. This, from Sherman, was the unkindest cut of all.[44]

Late Sunday evening came the denouement. Cleveland caused the press to be authoritatively informed that postponement until October, 1894, was out of the question, and that unconditional repeal could be accomplished in a week. "The President adheres to" unconditional repeal, read the fiat. Gorman's hothouse flower had died of exposure.[45]

VIII

October 23 was a blue Monday on Capitol Hill, as far as the Democrats were concerned. All signers of the defunct compromise desperately sought to save face and shift blame, each according to his participation. Speculative Democrats, of whom there were not many with sufficient

[44] New York *Herald, Times, Tribune,* and *World,* Oct. 22 and 23; Voorhees to Cleveland, Oct. 23, *Cleveland MSS.*

[45] New York *Times, Tribune,* Oct. 23, 24; *Nation,* Oct. 26. Cabinet members had been urging the administration to come out boldly against compromise, *e.g.,* Secretary J. S. Morton to Attorney General Olney, Oct. 9, 22, *Olney MSS.*

funds, had bought stocks on Friday for a rise; but now they had to raise collateral and see their colleagues reading a column in the New York *Times* which advised them "to be less candid" in referring to future transactions. Democrats who had been pledged to repeal but consented to sign the paper hated their role of deserters and accused administration members of the steering committee—Gray, Ransom, and White—of giving them very bad advice. Gray especially was berated in the Cabinet as well as in the Senate as the reputed author of the "October 1, 1894" provision. Secretary of State Gresham sized him up as a man who "is able to see the path of duty" but "lacks the courage to travel in it". A few senators, like Palmer and White, found empty satisfaction in withdrawing their signatures from the dead document. Voorhees was almost the only prominent person involved whose popularity was not badly hurt; and doubtless this was due to his considerate attitude during his managership.[46]

The contribution of Carlisle to the confusion is dubious. Gray, perhaps animated by a hope of re-establishing himself in the good graces of the administration, magnanimously exonerated Carlisle from having given him reason to believe he favored compromise; but Carlisle's own behavior remains none too clear. He was the member of the Cabinet with the most influence among Democrats, if Woodrow Wilson was not mistaken. He was a frequent visitor to the Senate and kept in touch with his former associates, who were, of course, familiar with his earlier record on silver. That record was such that the New York banking fraternity would have been alarmed, somewhat unjustly, at his appointment if they had not been confident of Cleveland's gold position. Carlisle had not been in office many weeks before he occasioned this class further concern. In responding on April 20 to the demands of business that concern over the gold standard be allayed, Carlisle had announced to the world that he would pay gold for Treasury notes as long as he had "gold lawfully available for that purpose". As this ambiguity continued the doubt, it added to the alarm and Cleveland found it necessary to make a statement of his own two days later declaring his absolute determination to maintain the public credit, faith, and parity between gold and silver.[47]

[46] The immediate, unofficial reaction of the compromisers to defeat was described in the papers of Oct. 23 and 24, especially the New York *Times* and *Tribune*. Recrimination began to creep into the official debates of the *Congressional Record* on Oct. 25 and found increasing place there up to the passage of the bill on Oct. 30. Gresham's views were expressed to Ambassador Bayard, Oct. 23, 29, Gresham MSS.

[47] Gray's statement referred to the interview in Carlisle's office, Thursday, Oct. 19, and

Carlisle's bungling then, as later, rose from the fact that his courage was not equal to his good intentions. On silver, his Senate experience cautioned him to avoid a course of action which might endanger his forthcoming tariff reform, which was very dear to his heart. He knew that no less a financier than J. Pierpont Morgan advised a temporary compromise to carry the country over until the Treasury was in a better condition. Naturally, he approached the extra session with a feeling that some concessions might have to be made; and this deposit of willingness seeped through the careful silence he maintained while acting the difficult role of emissary between the compromisers and the President. Probably the New York *Times* was right when it implied that Cleveland's Secretary of State understood him better than his Secretary of the Treasury, who need not have "run to him every two or three days to find out how he stood".[48]

Gorman's position was most unenviable. His newspaper enemies claimed Cleveland had not known, until Sunday, of Gorman's compromise, that Carlisle had never consented to it, that signatures were obtained to it "by deceit". Conservative business interests, whose support he craved, praised his party rival, Hill, as having hastened repeal by pushing cloture, and gave chief credit to the man Gorman had tried to undermine—Cleveland—through whom Gorman now was discredited. Telegrams poured in denouncing compromise. It was "deader than a doornail". Let it stay dead, said Democrats of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, Democrats facing an imminent election in districts little infected with the silver inflation virus.[49]

Such support as was available, this "sound money" compromiser had to find among Democrats who stood for inflation. Good haters like Pugh and Morgan, who had forgotten their debt to the conservative

was stressed by the New York *World*, Oct. 25. Banking opinion of Carlisle's appointment is summarized by A. Barton Hepburn, *History of the Currency* (New York, 1924), p. 349. The Republicans made much political capital of the Apr. 20-22 incident, utilizing it as proof that the administration caused the panic. See also Barnes, p. 293. Wilson's estimate of Carlisle is given in "Mr. Cleveland as President", *Atlantic Monthly*, LXXIX (Mar. 1897), 289–300.

[48] Barnes states that "By the middle of October the Treasury Department had become hopeful of defeating compromise and of carrying unconditional repeal" (p. 281), and that Carlisle backed Cleveland in his drive for repeal (p. 285). Barnes mentions Carlisle's initial uncertainty and Morgan's advice (p. 260), his lack of courage (p. 202), his tariff hopes (p. 213), and his attendance upon the Senate (p. 281). See also New York *Times*, Oct. 25.

[49] New York *Times*, Oct. 24, 26, 29, 31; New York *Tribune*, Oct. 29, 31; New York *World*, Oct. 25.

Democracy for saving Alabama from the Farmers' Alliance, vented their spleen on Cleveland. Pugh, who gloried in the title of "filibuster" whenever applied to him by "conspirators and lick-spittles of the gold kings", laid the failure of compromise "solely" on Cleveland and Carlisle. Morgan, sick with disappointment and wrath, admitted he had "signed that paper" and that his signature was invalidated because of "the President being unwilling to execute it".

But the President and Carlisle were not the men blamed most openly by the Democratic allies; a conspicuous Republican must be the target and Sherman seemed eligible. Gorman, ably seconded by Cockrell and Morgan, turned their guns upon the wily ex-Secretary of the Treasury. John Sherman, by his interview published on October 5 and his advice to the Democrats on October 17, had cruelly deceived them. He knew he was laying down a condition for them to unite upon a reduced purchase and bond bill. And yet, after the Democrats had risked their political constituencies for the sake of harmony, "the distinguished Senator from Ohio, with his Administration Republicans, were found in our front". Gorman, warming to his own defense and the attack on Sherman, assumed much credulity. He soberly assured the Senate that delay in the passage of the bill had been due to a desire on his part and that of his friends to convert enough Democrats to repeal. He also denied that the Democrats had split on the rock of the bond issue.

All these attempts to explain away the unexplainable were meat and drink to Sherman, who proved most elusive as Gorman's target. Far be it from Sherman to deny his own importance. The role of prophet and sage was too pleasant. He gladly owned paternity to the interview and the compromise suggestion, claiming superior vision. Repeal, he assured Gorman, could not have been obtained without first an abortive attempt at compromise. The country could note the implication that he had known all along what was going to happen. And from the high eminence of his superior understanding he darkly hinted at things which were gall and wormwood. These silver purchases, over which some senators had been risking so much, might prove, after all, not to be "the germ and root of the evil".[50]

Where, then, did all this leave Gorman and his compromise plans? On the dust heap; and it was Cleveland who had wielded the broom.

[50] The official and open diatribes were uttered in the Senate after repeal became certain, Voorhees giving his colleagues plenty of time for their swan songs. Pugh, Oct. 25, *Cong. Rec.*, pp. 2819-2821; Cockrell, Oct. 30, pp. 2947-2949.

IX

The first reaction of the Senate to the failure of compromise was depression and inaction; adjournment seemed further off than ever and the silverites droned on, and on. "It was dull weather, literally and legislatively. The gray daylight, straggling through the glass-panelled ceiling of the chamber, gave a worn, ghastly tinge to the dull, greenish-yellow matting on the floor, the shiny, yellowish-green panels on the walls, the gray upholstered seats of the gallery and the gold and white decorations of the ceiling. The whole atmosphere of the place was sullen and gloomy."[51]

More rain on Tuesday morning, the twenty-fourth, with the gas in the Chamber unlighted. About eleven o'clock the sun broke through, and it was observed that informal conferences were going on all over the Chamber. While Stewart occupied the floor, the compromise leaders, including Butler, Cockrell, Harris, Pugh, Vest, *et al.*, sidled into the room of the Committee on Appropriations. There they agreed that they no longer could support the silver filibuster; Cleveland had made it impossible; and they delegated Harris to notify Dubois. Harris, who at eleven o'clock had said he would filibuster till Hell froze over, at twelve o'clock "had his skates on ready to take advantage of the freshly formed sheet of ice". He did his duty faithfully, and at one o'clock Dubois succinctly informed the newspaper men "The jig is up".

More conferences through the afternoon, while Jones and his shiny coat took their turn on the floor. The Westerners concluded that the Southerners had shown altogether too much alacrity in signing the compromise. It had granted their Western industries so little that it would have left them worse off, politically, than if repeal were adopted. Unless the South would help filibuster until a compromise more generous to silver were signed, the coalition was indeed destroyed. Power and Kyle tested their erstwhile allies with two roll calls and found them helping the repealers make a quorum. Thereupon the silverites decided that they had well preserved the consistency of their records with the voters at home, had accumulated plenty of future campaign material, and could safely quit the filibuster. They preferred a vote on repeal to one on compromise—a showing of thirty votes to one of ten or twelve.

It was Jones who gave official notice of their decision. The white-bearded old man, weary and hoarse, "stepped conspicuously into the middle of the aisle, clasped his hands in front of his loose silk coat and thrust his head down into his shoulders with a curious mixture of sad-

[51] New York *World*, Oct. 24.

ness and pugnacity. The sluggish Senate, mentally asphyxiated hours before by the atmosphere and the mellow monotony of ceaseless speech . . . aroused itself to attention." The senator raised his voice impressively. "I also wish to again state that it is not the intention of anyone connected with this discussion to prolong it any more than is necessary to give his views fully to the Senate and to the people of the country." The Senate instantly awoke, and the galleries buzzed. "Senator Faulkner, with a queer ring in his voice" in haste acknowledged this notice, on behalf of the repealers. The flag of the filibuster was down.[52]

Thus was the filibuster added to the rapidly accumulating debris of the session, tossed on top of the discredited plans of Voorhees, Hill, and the Gorman coalition. Now, forces which would have been at work long before under normal conditions had more chance for functioning. Repeal undoubtedly was aided by the fact that the Sherman law was an admitted makeshift disliked by many factions. Furthermore, some of those arts of suasion of which Cleveland knew so little may have been practiced by divers members of his Cabinet. The fact that Lamont had working relations with Gorman, and Gresham with Vest cannot be ignored. At any rate, by the twenty-fifth of October, everybody in the Senate doubtless realized that the coast soon would be cleared for that unconditional repeal which Cleveland had asked on the eighth of August. Only a few more preliminaries had to be gone through with first.[53]

Time had to be allowed absent senators to return—Chandler, Hale and Morrill from New England, Allison and Wilson from Iowa, and Mitchell from faraway Oregon. A day or so of the natural relaxation which follows tension, ensued. Voorhees looked "several years younger". Harris basked in the cloakroom appreciation of his war stories. Butler grew chipper. The Senate officers even forgot the roll call at the start of one session. Then there were the swan songs to tolerate, from the silver men, the Populists, and the defeated compromisers. Sherman, also, had to be quieted, lest he rouse the silver men with a demand for a bond issue.

Word went out that Voorhees would not admit even the Ten Commandments as an amendment and that Aldrich would not for his part tolerate anything delaying repeal. But the more radical anti-repealers were to be allowed to vote for various substitutes without harming repeal.

[52] New York *Times, Tribune, World,* Oct. 25; Oct. 24, *Cong. Rec.,* pp. 2792–2793.

[53] Letters bearing upon the administration contacts include Hill to Marble, Aug. 14, Marble MSS.; Gorman to Lamont, Aug. 14, 15, and Sept. 26, Lamont MSS.; Vest to Gresham, Sept. 1, Dec. 11, Gresham MSS.

On the motion to restore the Bland-Allison Act, there was a general rush to the silver side, 33-37, leaving the repealers only four votes to spare. The Secretary of State thought "a number of senators who voted for that amendment did so with their eyes upon their constituents, knowing it could not be adopted"; but the fact was, that by contrast the Bland-Allison Act had far more popularity as a compromise than the Sherman Act ever enjoyed.[54]

One more disappointment was in store for the long-suffering Mr. Voorhees. He set the stage for the repeal vote to be taken between two and four o'clock on the afternoon of Monday, October 30. The galleries filled to witness the victory; then Jones arose. He resumed his speech—the speech he had begun on October 14 and had continued, intermittently, on each of five days since. The crowds left. Not until seven-thirty did Jones turn the last sheet of his manuscript. His speech entire must fill one hundred pages of the *Congressional Record*. Then, at last, was the legislative day of October 17 (reputed to be the longest in the history of the Senate to that date) brought to a close with a vote on repeal. It passed 43-32—an anti-climax.[55]

All were glad it was over, and the repeal Republicans took the trains for home with a mixture of self-satisfaction and relief. They had furnished the support which the President could not have done without to get repeal, but it had made them uncomfortable. As Chandler put it, "We can be discharged from following Cleveland, Carlisle, and Voorhees and resume our allegiance."[56]

Probably few of the Republican senators, if any, stopped to reflect upon certain ominous signs in the West. Signs that the silver men would exact toll of the tariff. Peffer had told the Senate that his constituents would not want him to support the tariff, but luxury duties, large estate taxes, and income taxes. Teller had told them they need not be surprised if in the future Westerners declined to yield their judgment to Easterners on matters in which the West had no local interest; and Sherman's rejoinder that silver was a smaller industry than cotton, corn, and manufacturing, did not alter the earnestness of the silverites. Wolcott remained impassioned and eloquent and Teller gloomily hopeless

[54] New York *Times* and *Tribune*, Oct 25-29, inclusive; Gresham to Bayard, Oct. 29, Gresham MSS; Oct. 28, *Cong. Rec.*, p. 2920.

[55] New York *Tribune*, *Times*, Oct. 31; *Cong. Rec.*, pp. 2955–2958; Jones's speech, Oct. 14, 16, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30, *ibid.*, app., pp. 606–705; 28 *U. S. Stat.*, 4, Nov. 1, 1893.

[56] Chandler to Frye, Oct. 22, Chandler MSS.

and therefore the more impressive. They would be heard in the Senate again and soon.[57]

Needless to say, no conference, adjourned or otherwise, met in Brussels "on a day late in November" of 1893. There had been some demand, during the height of the filibuster, that Cleveland announce a willingness to bring about a remeeting of the conference; but he had hedged, with a vague statement that the proper place of silver in our currency could not "be entered upon profitably" until after purchases were stopped. This left senators free to dispute as to his real attitude toward reassembling the Monetary Conference begun in 1892.

If the issue could be shunted to the rear, now that repeal was accomplished, the sleep of the titular leader of the demoralized Democratic party would be less disturbed; but that "leader" had co-operated with a Republican-Democratic-Mugwump coalition to kill a party compromise, a sin of first importance in the eyes of an unforgiving Democratic partisan. Nor were other reasons lacking why silver could not be forgotten. The circumstances under which the United States stopped purchases, and India stopped coinage, together contributed to a revival of the issue on both sides of the Atlantic, and guaranteed it a long life, nationally and internationally, thereafter. It was in the cards to wreck the administration that chanced to be at Washington during these fateful events. Forty years later another Democratic administration would endeavor to employ the political and personal elements in the silver issue so as to derive strength therefrom.

JEANNETTE PADDOCK NICHOLS.

Washington.

[57] New York *Times, Tribune,* Oct. 29; *Cong. Rec.,* Oct. 28, 30.

THE SINKING OF THE LUSITANIA

On November 3, 1914, some three months after the outbreak of the World War, Great Britain proclaimed her intention of mining the North Sea and of transforming it into a military area. The official British statement announced that such "exceptional measures" had been made necessary by Germany's alleged practice of scattering mines in the open sea in violation of international law. The German government, regarding this innovation as both an illegal blockade and an attempt to starve out Germany, concluded that the only effective means of redress lay in retaliation. Accordingly, on February 4, 1915, the German admiralty declared a war zone about the British Isles, effective February 18, 1915, and announced that German submarines would attempt to destroy all enemy merchantmen found within that area.

The war zone had been established for approximately ten weeks and had taken a toll of sixty-six merchant ships, when, on April 30, 1915, the German submarine *U 20* left Emden for a station off Liverpool.[1] The written orders issued to Lieutenant-Commander Schwieger, of the U-boat, instructed him to attack "transport ships, merchant ships, [and] warships". There was no mention, at least in writing, of lying in wait for any particular vessel.[2] The voyage of the *U 20* around northern Scotland and western Ireland was comparatively uneventful until the sixth day out, when the submarine destroyed a small British schooner off the southwestern coast of Ireland.[3] On the next day (May 6) the

[1] This figure includes several which were sunk by mines. See New York *Times*, May 8, 1915.

[2] The general orders issued jointly to both the *U 27* and the *U 20* are found in the war diary of Fregattenkapitän Bauer and read as follows [tr.]: "The Third Submarine Half-Flotilla accordingly receives wireless orders for *U 20* and *U 27*: 'Large English troop transports expected starting from Liverpool, Bristol Channel, Dartmouth. In order to do considerable damage to transports *U 20* and *U 27* are to be dispatched as soon as possible. Assign stations there. Get to stations on the fastest possible route around Scotland; hold them as long as supplies permit. *U 30* has orders to go to Dartmouth. Submarines are to attack transport ships, merchant ships, warships. Wire time of departure'." Marine-Archiv, Kriegstagebuch des Führers der U-Boote der Hochseeflotte, Fregattenkapitän Bauer, Band 2, vom 25. Apr., 1915. A photostatic copy of these orders was obtained from the German marine archives through the courtesy of Admiral Arno Spindler. If Schwieger had received supplementary oral or wireless orders to sink the *Lusitania* his course would have been altogether different.

[3] *Ibid.*, Kriegstagebuch S.M.U-Boot U 20, Band 3, vom 30. IV. bis 13. V. 15,

U-boat, although frustrated in an attack upon a 14,000 ton White Star passenger liner, succeeded in sinking two British freight steamers. On the same afternoon Schwieger decided, primarily because of an unexpected shortage of oil, to discontinue the trip to Liverpool and to remain south of the entrance into Bristol Channel until the fuel supply made the return trip imperative.[4]

Thus it was that on the early afternoon of May 7, 1915, the *U 20*, having already begun its homeward voyage, sighted a large passenger steamer (later discovered to be the *Lusitania*) about a dozen miles off the Old Head of Kinsale, southern Ireland.[5] In pursuance of his general

Kommandant Kapitänleutnant Schwieger. Unless otherwise noted, the details preceding and including the sinking of the *Lusitania* have been taken from the diary of Schwieger, a photostatic copy of which was also secured through Admiral Spindler.

[4] Apropos of this decision the Schwieger diary for May 6 reads [tr.]: "A further advance toward Liverpool, the real field of operations, abandoned for the following reasons: [three have to do with heavy fog as a factor] (4) The voyage to the St. George's Channel had consumed so much of our fuel oil that it would be impossible for us to return [to Germany] around the southern end of Ireland if we had now continued to Liverpool. I intend to return as soon as two fifths of our fuel oil is used up. I intend to avoid, if at all possible, the trip through the North Channel on account of the type of patrol service which the *U 20* encountered there on her last trip. (5) Only three torpedoes are still available, of which I wish to save two, if possible, for the return trip. It is therefore decided to remain south of the entrance into the Bristol Channel and to attack steamers until two fifths of the fuel oil has been used up; especially since chances for favorable attacks are better here and enemy defensive measures less effective, than in the Irish Sea near Liverpool." The entry for 10 A. M. on May 7 reads, "Since the fog does not abate, I now resolve upon the return journey, in order to push out into the North Channel in case of good weather".

[5] The diary reads [tr.]: "Ahead and to starboard four funnels and two masts of a steamer with course perpendicular to us come into sight (coming from SSW it steered toward Galley Head). Ship is made out to be large passenger steamer. [We] submerged to a depth of eleven meters and went ahead at full speed, taking a course converging with the one of the steamer, hoping it might change its course to starboard along the Irish coast. The steamer turns to starboard, takes course to Queenstown thus making possible an approach for a shot. Until 3 P. M. we ran at high speed in order to gain position directly ahead. Clean bow shot at a distance of 700 meters (G-torpedo, three meters depth adjustment); angle 90°, estimated speed twenty-two knots. Torpedo hits starboard side right behind the bridge. An unusually heavy explosion takes place with a very strong explosion cloud (cloud reaches far beyond front funnel). The explosion of the torpedo must have been followed by a second one (boiler or coal or powder?). The superstructure right above the point of impact and the bridge are torn asunder, fire breaks out, and smoke envelops the high bridge. The ship stops immediately and heels over to starboard very quickly, immersing simultaneously at the bow. It appears as if the ship were going to capsize very shortly. Great confusion ensues on board; the boats are made clear and some of them are lowered to the water. In doing so great confusion must have reigned; some boats, full to capacity, are lowered, rushed from above, touch the water with either stem or stern first and founder immediately. On the port side fewer boats are made clear than on the starboard side on account of the ship's list. The ship blows off [steam];

and specific orders, Schwieger immediately prepared to attack without revealing his presence. His natural impulse would have been to warn the vessel, in accordance with international law, and give the passengers and crew an opportunity to take to the small boats before he fired a torpedo. But to do so he would have to emerge and expose his frail craft to the danger of being rammed by the swift liner—a danger of which he was fully conscious.[6] Although he may have had no specific knowledge as to the presence or absence of arms on this particular ship, he knew perfectly well (as his diary shows) that many British merchantmen were armed, and that if he attempted to warn this one he would be taking a dangerous chance. Moreover, it was obvious that if the slow-moving *U 20* emerged to warn its victim the swift liner could easily outdistance the submarine and carry its cargo of ammunition (which British passenger ships were known to carry) safely to its destination.[7] From a purely military standpoint it seemed foolhardy to expose the *U 20* to unnecessary danger and permit the enemy munitions to escape, particularly when a sure means of destroying the liner lay at hand. There appeared to be no safe middle ground between attacking without warning and not attacking at all.

The speeding submarine would have failed by a wide margin to intercept the *Lusitania* had not the liner suddenly and at precisely the critical moment changed her course to starboard, thus enabling the *U 20* to discharge one torpedo, which struck with terrible effect. This explosion was immediately followed by another, the cause of which is still conjectural. In spite of the smooth seas the liner immediately began to founder, and in the astonishingly short space of eighteen minutes disappeared beneath the waves. Schwieger recorded that just before the vessel sank the name "Lusitania" became visible on the bow; and he expressed surprise at finding this well-known ship plying her regular course, particularly in view of the fact that he had sunk two British

on the bow the name "Lusitania" becomes visible in golden letters. The funnels were painted black, no flag was set astern. Ship was running twenty knots. Since it seems as if the steamer will keep above water only a short time, we dived to a depth of twenty-four meters and ran out to sea. It would have been impossible for me, anyhow, to fire a second torpedo into this crowd of people struggling to save their lives." Fifty minutes later the *U 20* viewed the scene through her periscope. The *Lusitania* had disappeared. In the distance a number of lifeboats were drifting.

[6] Schwieger's diary clearly reveals this.

[7] Churchill admitted on the floor of the House of Commons, Mar. 16, 1914, that forty merchantmen were then defensively armed. *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., vol. LIX, col. 1683. The maximum speed of the *U 20* was approximately twelve knots; that of the *Lusitania* between twenty-one and twenty-four knots.

steamers near the same place just the day before. He knew perfectly well that the British admiralty was sending out wireless warnings of submarine activity, and had it been his purpose to waylay the *Lusitania* he probably would have taken every precaution to avoid betraying his presence.

The appalling destruction of women, children, and other noncombatants on the *Lusitania*[8] shocked the civilized world and caused the United States, as the only powerful neutral involved and as the one suffering the heaviest losses, to make strong representations to Germany. In defending the action of the submarine the German foreign office maintained, first of all, that the *Lusitania* was, in effect, a British warship and that as such she was subject to destruction without warning. Since international law provides that a man-of-war may be attacked on sight (unlike bona fide merchantmen, which must always be warned) this charge should be examined.

It was common knowledge that both the *Lusitania* and her sister ship, the *Mauretania,* in line with a policy usual among nations with a large merchant marine, had been built with money lent by the British government at a low rate of interest, and that the Cunard company received a large annual subsidy for holding these two liners in readiness for war service. As the plans published in 1907 indicated, the *Lusitania* was constructed with emplacements for twelve six-inch quick-firing guns (from the drawings the guns appeared to be mounted), and it was generally known that in the event of hostilities the vessel could be speedily converted into a fighting craft.[9] The *Mauretania* was, in fact, transferred to the British admiralty early in the war, and was used for some time exclusively for military purposes, in which capacity she was subject to destruction without warning. The *Lusitania* was also taken over by the admiralty, but because of her heavy consumption of coal was soon returned to the Cunard company.[10] It would seem, however, that this temporary detention by the British authorities could not be construed as materially affecting her status.

[8] Of the 1959 passengers and members of the crew, 1198 perished; of the passengers drowned, 270 were women and 94 children. Of 197 Americans, 128 lost their lives. The general figures may be found in the official report of Lord Mersey, wreck commissioner of the United Kingdom, which appeared in 1915. *Parl. Papers* [Command 8022], 1915, *Reports,* vol. XXVII, hereafter cited as *Mersey Report.* The more accurate figures relating to the Americans may be found in Secretary Hughes's report of March 31, 1922. *Sen. Doc.,* 67 Cong., 2 sess., no. 176.

[9] See British weekly journal, *Engineering,* Aug. 2, 1907, p. 133.

[10] Sir Julian S. Corbett, *Naval Operations* (London, 1920–1921), I, 29–30; II, 391. This account is based on admiralty documents.

It should also be noted that the captain of the *Lusitania* was a commander of the British Royal Naval Reserve.[11] A silhouette of his vessel appeared in Jane's *Fighting Ships* for 1914; and both the *Lusitania* and the *Mauretania* were listed as "armed merchantmen" under "Royal Naval Reserve Merchant Cruisers" in the British *Naval Pocket Book for 1914*.[12] But these details do not alter the fact that technically the *Lusitania* was not a warship. Although operating under the direction of the British admiralty, she was not incorporated in the armed forces of a belligerent, and she was known to be engaged solely in the transportation of passengers, mail, and freight, in pursuance of which she was just completing her fifth round trip across the Atlantic since the beginning of the war.[13] As an enemy merchantman she was fair prize, but under the law of nations she could not be sunk without warning.

If the *Lusitania* had been armed and otherwise prepared for offensive operations her status would have been that of a warship. The German foreign office at first insisted that she was equipped with guns, and the German ambassador to the United States, Count Bernstorff, presented several affidavits to the Department of State in support of this contention. Such evidence, however, was soon discredited, particularly when one of the witnesses involved, a German reservist, confessed to perjury and was imprisoned.[14] If, in fact, the German authorities had known that the *Lusitania* was offensively armed, it is difficult to understand why they did not take steps to secure her detention.

With regard to the absence of guns we may observe that the *Lusitania* was thoroughly searched during the week prior to sailing by the special "neutrality squad", and on the morning of her departure by Mr. Dudley Field Malone, collector of the Port of New York; and no armament was found.[15] To the official denial of the British government must be added

[11] But she was neither officered nor manned by the regular navy.

[12] Fred T. Jane, *Fighting Ships* (London, 1914), p. 32; Viscount Hythe and John Leyland, eds., *The Naval Annual*, 1914 (London, 1914), p. 207; see also a summary by Park Benjamin in the *Independent*, May 17, 1915, pp. 284–287. Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, 1915, *Foreign Relations, 1915 Supplement*, p. 420. Hereafter cited as *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.*

[13] If the *Lusitania* had been engaged in warlike service she would not have been cleared by the New York port authorities. Lansing to Gerard (telegram), June 9, 1915, *ibid.*, p. 437.

[14] New York *Times*, June 3, 9, 11, 19, Sept. 10, 1915.

[15] The "neutrality squad" was given detailed instructions to look for guns or evidences of an attempt to mount guns. Since the location of the emplacements was known, and since the planking covering them had to be torn up before the vessel could be armed, it is evident that the concealment of this operation would have been difficult. A good idea of the extreme care exercised by the port officials at this time may be obtained from the

the testimony of the officers of the *Lusitania* to the effect that there were no guns on board. Not a single one of the one hundred and nine witnesses who eventually testified appears to have even glimpsed any armament.[16] The extreme difficulty, to say nothing of impossibility, of concealing mounted guns from so great a number of observers must be apparent. We may conclude, therefore, that the evidence points strongly, if not overwhelmingly, to the absence of armament on the *Lusitania.*

One other aspect of this same problem must be considered. Early in the war two British merchantmen entered American ports equipped with guns for defense against German cruisers being employed as commerce destroyers. Since the law of nations has long permitted merchant vessels to carry an armament for protection against pirates and privateers, the Department of State ruled, on September 19, 1914, that belligerent merchantmen would be permitted to leave American ports with mounted six-inch guns if it could be demonstrated that these weapons were designed for defensive purposes only. The German foreign office argued, however, that what was defensive armament against cruisers was offensive armament against submarines. No armed merchantman would go out of its way to try conclusions with a German warship, since the best that it could hope for was to escape after a running fight. But one well-placed shot from an armed passenger ship could easily send a submarine to the bottom; and consciousness of this superiority in strength might easily tempt the merchantman to assume the offensive. In these circumstances the Germans maintained that the introduction of the submarine made the old distinction between offensive and defensive armament illusory. Early in 1916, the Department of State, although later reversing itself, evidenced a disposition to accept this interpretation.[17] In any event, even if the *Lusitania* had left New York with a defensive

copy of Dudley Field Malone's official report on the *Lusitania* which appeared in the New York *World,* Dec. 4, 1922. In August, 1934, Mr. Malone assured the writer that nothing essential was omitted from the printed report. His own copy of the original could not be conveniently located. Neither the Treasury Department, the Department of State, nor former Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo was able to find the original report or a copy of it.

[16] Thirty-six witnesses testified during the Mersey investigation, and the remainder in connection with the decision of Judge Mayer, of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, with regard to limiting the liability of the Cunard company. "The 'Lusitania'", in *International Conciliation,* Nov., 1918 (no. 132), pp. 5–6. For the decision, see 251 *Federal Reporter* 715.

[17] For the correspondence on this subject, see *For. Rel., 1914 Suppl.,* pp. 593–615; *1916 Suppl.,* pp. 146–147.

armament of six-inch guns it does not appear that international law, at least as it was interpreted at that time by the United States, would have sanctioned her destruction without warning.

The question of ramming, as well as that of armament, has an important bearing on the *Lusitania* case. On February 10, 1915, the British admiralty issued secret orders in which the masters of British merchantmen were instructed as follows: "If a submarine comes up suddenly close ahead of you with obvious hostile intention, steer straight for her at your utmost speed, altering course as necessary to keep her ahead." [18] In other words, orders were given to attack before the enemy craft could possibly give the warning prescribed by international law. Captain Turner, of the *Lusitania,* later admitted under oath that he was in possession of these instructions; and presumably he was cognizant of their import.[19] The German government soon learned of the secret orders (from time to time copies of them were secured from captured vessels), and on February 15, 1915, presented its grievance to the Department of State, including the charge that the British had offered a large sum of money for the destruction of the first German submarine by a British merchantman.[20] This reward, in fact, was soon claimed by three different ships, and during the ensuing months several British captains were decorated or otherwise rewarded for ramming or attempting to ram submarines.[21]

The German foreign office maintained, not without reason, that in view of the British secret orders it was suicidal for Germany to conform to international law in its submarine warfare; that these orders converted British merchantmen into offensively armed vessels; and that as such they were warships subject to destruction without warning.[22] Just a few weeks after the *Lusitania* disaster, a British liner, the *Cameronia,* almost rammed a German submarine, and then outdistanced it.[23] Captain Turner probably would have resorted to similar measures, and perhaps with more success, had an opportunity presented itself. A merchantman, of course, is privileged to resist attack, but the law of

[18] Other orders were given to facilitate escape from submarine attack, photographic copies of which were sent by Ambassador Gerard to the Department of State. *Ibid., 1915 Suppl.,* pp. 653–654.

[19] See hearings, *in camera,* before Lord Mersey. *Parl. Papers* [Command 381], *Reports, 1919,* vol. XXV, pp. 2–3; hereafter cited as *Mersey Hearings.*

[20] *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* pp. 104–105.

[21] New York *Times,* Mar. 6; *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* p. 442.

[22] Von Jagow to Gerard, July 8, 1915, *ibid.,* p. 465. The British view was that such secret orders had become necessary because of the German practice of sinking without warning.

[23] New York *Times,* June 22, 1915.

nations holds that in so doing it assumes the status of a man-of-war. In other words, Captain Turner was sailing under orders, which, if he had attempted without success to carry out, would have made it lawful for the submarine ruthlessly to destroy his vessel with everyone on board. All in all, there appears to have been considerable justice in the contention of the German foreign office that the giant Cunarder, whatever its technical status, was not just an "ordinary unarmed merchant vessel". Even the American ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard, who was by no means pro-German in his sympathies, wired that "English passenger ships sailing with orders to ram submarines and often armed" could not "be put quite in the category of altogether peaceful merchantmen".[24]

In attempting to justify the action of the *U 20* the German foreign office made much of the fact that the *Lusitania* was carrying a considerable quantity of munitions. This is true but, from the standpoint of international law, entirely irrelevent. Whatever the moral implications, the nature of the cargo has no legal bearing upon the time-honored rule that no merchantman shall be sunk without warning. But since the death of so many unoffending noncombatants profoundly aroused public sentiment, and since the German foreign office claimed that the passengers probably would have been saved had not the sinking of the vessel been greatly accelerated by exploding munitions, this charge must be examined.[25] The matter assumes an even more serious aspect when we bear in mind that one of the few points upon which the survivors almost unanimously agreed was that a second explosion of some kind immediately followed the detonation of the torpedo.

In monetary value approximately one half of the cargo of the *Lusitania* was composed of materials being shipped for the use of the Allied forces. The manifest listed such items as brass, copper, 4200 cases of cartridges for rifles, and "1250 cases Shrapnel".[26] Mr. Malone stated in his official report, however, that the shrapnel cases were empty and "contained no fuses and no explosives of any description whatsoever". But with regard to the cartridges the German foreign office pointed out that the statutes of the United States forbade the transportation of explo-

[24] Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.*, p. 420; Gerard to Lansing (telegram), July 5, 1915, *ibid.*, p. 461.

[25] See the three German *Lusitania* notes. *Ibid.*, pp. 389, 420, 465; Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, 1915, *ibid.*, p. 420.

[26] The writer was privileged to examine a photostatic reproduction of the original manifest in Washington, D. C. He was requested, however, not to state where this document is filed. An abbreviated copy may be found in the New York *Times*, May 8, 1915.

sives on passenger vessels; and that as a consequence the *Lusitania* had placed herself outside the pale by violating the law. Mr. Malone's answer was that in President Taft's administration ordnance experts had concluded that such small arms ammunition could not be exploded *en masse* by fire or concussion, and that the Department of Commerce and Labor had consequently ruled that munitions of this kind could be legally carried on passenger ships.[27] It is conceivable, however, that the experts were mistaken, and that the intense heat generated by the torpedo explosion ignited the ten to eleven tons of powder in the cartridges. Mr. Malone, himself, thinks that this possibility is not to be dismissed lightly. He even concedes that considerable quantities of high explosives may have been smuggled on board.[28] The exploding munitions theory gains further support when we note that the giant Cunarder, which was equipped with devices to render her unsinkable, went to the bottom within eighteen minutes after being struck by one torpedo. By way of contrast it should be observed that there were many instances, as Schwieger had had occasion to observe on the previous day, when vessels not even one fifth the size of the *Lusitania* did not sink at all after being torpedoed only once; or sank slowly; or required a second torpedo or gunfire to complete their destruction. In any event, since we can definitely eliminate a second torpedo, the odds in favor of the exploding munitions theory are considerably increased, although the possibility of an explosion from the boilers or from some other source must not be disregarded.

The German foreign office at first charged that the *Lusitania* was carrying Canadian troops, the implication being that as a transport in the service of the enemy she was liable to destruction without warning. It would seem, however, that the *Lusitania* could not be regarded as a transport unless she was conveying an organized body of troops; and of their existence there is no evidence. Assuming that the Canadian authorities resorted to the clumsy and highly irregular practice of embarking their troops at American ports, it is difficult to see how such a body of soldiers, even without uniforms, could have escaped the vigilance

[27] Ruling of May 2, 1911, in interpretation and limitation of section 4472 of the *Revised Statutes of the United States*. See Malone Report, New York *World*, Dec. 4, 1922; also Mr. Malone's letter to the New York *Nation*, Jan. 3, 1923, pp. 15–16.

[28] Conversation with the writer in August, 1934. Mr. Malone had previously stated that it was a "physical impossibility" to examine every package going on board every ship, and that he relied upon the sworn manifest unless suspicious circumstances seemed to warrant an exhaustive search. Letter to the *Nation*, Jan. 3, 1923, pp. 15–16. The *Mersey Report* (p. 6) states that the ammunition was stored well forward, about 150 feet from the spot where the torpedo struck. This, however, is not an unbiased source.

of the port authorities or the observation of the officers on the vessel.[29] If the German officials, as they stated, knew that the *Lusitania* was a troop ship, they could easily have secured her detention by placing the necessary evidence in the hands of the American authorities.

We have repeatedly observed that the *Lusitania* was torpedoed without warning. The German officials admitted that she was not destroyed in the orthodox fashion, but they contended that she had been adequately warned and that as a consequence her sinking was in conformity with international law. They pointed out that the first warning had been given in February, 1915, some three months before the *Lusitania* disaster, when Germany announced that she would destroy all enemy ships found within the zone established around the British Isles. The second warning came, indirectly yet forcefully, when the Germans demonstrated their seriousness of purpose by sinking dozens of merchantmen within that zone. In fact, ninety merchantmen were so destroyed during the eleven weeks before the *Lusitania* went down, twenty-two of them while the giant Cunarder was actually making her last voyage.[30] The third warning appeared as a newspaper advertisement, and to this we must now turn.

On the morning of May 1, 1915, the day on which the *Lusitania* departed, the following advertisement, placed conspicuously near the sailing notices of the Cunard company, appeared in the leading New York newspapers:

NOTICE!

TRAVELLERS intending to embark on the Atlantic voyage are reminded that a state of war exists between Germany and her allies and Great Britain and her allies; that the zone of war includes the waters adjacent to the British Isles; that, in accordance with formal notice given by the Imperial German Government, vessels flying the flag of Great Britain, or of any of her allies, are liable to destruction in those waters and that travellers sailing in the war zone on ships of Great Britain or her allies do so at their own risk.

IMPERIAL GERMAN EMBASSY

Washington, D. C., April 22, 1915.[31]

[29] Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.*, p. 420. Secretary Lansing invited the German government to present any evidence it possessed to the effect that the port authorities had been derelict in their duty. Lansing to Gerard (telegram), June 9, 1915, *ibid.*, p. 437. The *Lusitania's* officers testified that the steamer was transporting no troops. *Mersey Report*, p. 6. There were a number of Canadians on board, some of them the families of officers abroad. It was possible, as Mr. Malone suggested, that a few reservists may have sailed as ordinary civilians. See Malone Report, New York *World*, Dec. 4, 1922. See also, New York *Times*, May 9, 11, 1915; New York *Evening Journal*, May 1, 1915.

[30] For the list, see New York *Times*, May 8, 1915.

[31] *Ibid.*, May 1, 1915.

In the light of what subsequently happened the appearance of the warning on the sailing day and its proximity to the Cunard advertisement were regarded as conclusive proof of German premeditation. Yet it should be observed that the statement contained no specific mention of the *Lusitania;* and this fact would tend to support the statement of Ambassador Bernstorff, made shortly before the sinking, that the notice was intended merely as a general friendly warning.[32] Several days later the German embassy added that such action had been necessary because the Department of State, in spite of German representations, had refused to apprise Americans of the grave risks they ran in traveling on Allied ships.[33] Ambassador Bernstorff's own explanation of the date of insertion, which is supported by circumstantial evidence, further weakens the premeditation theory.[34] Finally, Schwieger's orders and his diary, which we have already considered, reveal clearly that the meeting of the *U 20* with the *Lusitania* was purely fortuitous.[35]

In this connection we may further observe that the Manchester *Guardian* attached particular significance to the fact that the *Lusitania* was the first transatlantic liner out of ninety-one vessels to be sunk in the submarine zone, concluding that the Germans had suddenly decided to inaugurate a new campaign of frightfulness by attacking passenger ships, and that they had deliberately begun with the queen of Britain's merchant fleet.[36] But the fate of the *Falaba,*[37] to say nothing of earlier

[32] *Ibid.*, May 2, 1915. Other New York newspapers printed similar accounts.

[33] *Ibid.*, May 10, 1915; Count Bernstorff, *My Three Years in America* (New York, 1920) pp. 131, 139.

[34] Count Bernstorff states that it had been decided to insert the notice for three successive Saturdays (the day on which the Cunarders sailed), but because of certain technical difficulties the advertisement appeared for the first time on May 1 instead of April 24. In support of this statement we find that the warning was dated Washington, D. C., April 22, thus allowing only two days for insertion, and that it appeared again in the New York newspapers on Saturday, May 8, the day after the disaster and at a time when deference to outraged American opinion would have suggested its omission. The German embassy sensed the situation, and on May 12 notified the newspapers to discontinue the notice, which was scheduled to be printed again on the following Saturday. New York *Times,* May 1, 8, 10, 1915; *Current History,* II (June, 1915), 413; Bernstorff, pp. 135 ff.; George Sylvester Viereck, *Spreading Germs of Hate* (New York, 1930), pp. 59 ff.

[35] The futility of ordering a slow-moving submarine to waylay a swift liner in what was virtually the open seas must be evident.

[36] Manchester *Guardian,* May 8, 1915; New York *Sun,* May 9, 1915.

[37] On March 28, 1915, an unarmed British passenger ship bound for West Africa, the *Falaba,* was destroyed with a loss of 104 lives, one of them an American. The British claimed that the vessel had not been properly warned. This was the first passenger ship, although the thirty-sixth merchantman, to be sunk after the war zone became effective.

victims, suggests that the Germans would not hesitate to sink a passenger liner if an opportunity presented itself; and it appears that the superior speed of the transatlantic vessels was chiefly responsible for preventing an earlier disaster of this kind. In fact, late in March, 1915, a White Star liner, the *Arabic,* and a French Line passenger ship, the *Niagara,* both outran attacking submarines;[38] and the day before Schwieger torpedoed the *Lusitania* he attempted to sink a White Star passenger liner but was frustrated by the superior speed of his intended victim.[39] There seems to be no good reason, then, for supposing that the Germans would not have sunk the giant Cunarder earlier if they had been able to do so.

The misconception is also prevalent that the newspaper warning was not printed in time to be effective, or that it did not impress upon the passengers the danger into which they were venturing. As a matter of fact, the advertisement created a sensation, which was abundantly reflected in leave-takings at the pier and in anxious conversations during the voyage.[40] A number of the English voyagers even wrote farewell letters to their home folk to follow later that day on an American vessel. It would, of course, have been awkward at that late hour to change to other ships, but in most cases this could have been done. Nevertheless, practically no bookings were canceled, and the *Lusitania* sailed with her largest eastbound passenger list of the year.[41]

We may assume, then, that the passengers weighed the inconvenience of changing to another and slower vessel with the possibilities of being sunk, and decided to stay with the *Lusitania.* It was widely believed that the Germans were bluffing and that they would not dare to outrage world opinion by sinking an unarmed passenger ship laden with women and children. A number of the more prominent passengers were even quoted as having spoken flippantly of their danger. Moreover, there was great confidence in the remarkable speed of the vessel, and a general feeling, approaching boastfulness among the ship's officers, Cunard officials, and others, that the *Lusitania* could run away from any possible

[38] Alfred Booth, an official of the Cunard company, stated that up to May 7, 1915, the Germans had never torpedoed a ship that was traveling faster than fourteen knots. New York *Times,* Mar. 28, June 17, 1915.

[39] Schwieger diary, entry of May 6, 1915.

[40] New York *Times,* May 8, 9, 10, 1915. The rumor that prominent passengers were personally warned at the pier by German agents appears to have been without foundation. New York *American,* May 2, 1915; New York *Evening Journal,* May 1, 1915; New York *Tribune,* May 2, 1915; New York *Times,* May 2, 8, 1915.

[41] Lady Rhondda, "May 7th, 1915", *Spectator,* May 5, 1923, pp. 747–748. *Der Lusitania-Fall im Urteile von deutschen Gelehrten* (Breslau, 1915), p. 9.

assailant. It was also believed, even among naval experts, that the great size and special construction of the liner rendered her unsinkable, or at least capable of remaining afloat until all the lifeboats could be lowered. Finally, a number of passengers appear to have been led to believe that the British admiralty would send out an armed escort when the ship neared home waters [42]—a delusion which will be examined later.

The appalling loss of American life, which apparently blinded public opinion in the United States to the fact that several Americans had already been killed under similar circumstances in the war zone,[43] was the feature of the disaster which caused the most serious international complications. As a consequence the question was frequently asked why these unfortunate voyagers should have taken passage on a munitions laden British ship, particularly after they had been generally and specifically warned of their danger. It is true that American citizens had an indisputable legal right to travel on an unarmed belligerent merchantman. At the same time it was perfectly evident that British merchant ships, as well as those of neutrals,[44] were then being sunk without adequate provision for the safety of those on board, and that, regardless of neutral rights, the Germans would probably deal with the *Lusitania* in the same way if they had a chance. Nevertheless, 197 Americans went—'committed suicide', as one German sympathizer put it.[45] Some were in haste to transact legitimate business, and to gain a day or so they risked and lost their lives. Others were pleasure-bound; and their sporting instinct prompted them to take a chance—a well-recognized American trait.[46] If these misguided people saw fit to court death in this fashion, that, many argued, was their business. But the disaster came

[42] New York *Times*, May 2, 8, 9, 10, 16, 1915; New York *Tribune*, May 2, 1915; Wesley Frost, *German Submarine Warfare* (New York, 1918), pp. 186–187, 195; Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (Boston, 1926), I, 361; Charles E. Lauriat, jr., *The Lusitania's Last Voyage* (Boston, 1915), p. 6.

[43] An American had lost his life on the British passenger ship, the *Falaba* (March 28, 1915); and at least two Americans had been killed when an American steamer, the *Gulflight*, was torpedoed on May 1, 1915. Technically the first case was as great a violation of American rights as the sinking of the *Lusitania;* and the torpedoing of a ship flying the United States flag was certainly a more flagrant violation of American rights than the destruction of a British vessel with the incidental loss of neutral lives.

[44] Of the ninety merchantmen destroyed in the submarine zone before the *Lusitania* sank, twenty-one were neutral. In issuing the war zone proclamation the German admiralty had announced that because of the flying of neutral flags by the belligerents and the contingencies of maritime warfare, it would not always be possible to avoid sinking neutral ships.

[45] New York *Times*, May 10, 1915.

[46] *Ibid.*, May 2, 1915.

uncomfortably close to plunging 100,000,000 Americans into the war as early as May, 1915; and a number of observers agreed with Secretary Bryan that it was hardly fair for irresponsible or selfish persons to be allowed to exercise such tremendous power for ill.[47] Those Americans who sailed on the *Lusitania* were well within their rights but they were not prudent.

It may further be observed that Secretary Bryan was not without supporters when he argued that, regardless of technical rights, the United States could avoid a great deal of trouble by prohibiting its citizens from traveling on munitions laden British merchantmen. President Wilson, however, insisted upon the full letter of the law.[48] The Germans were quick to note an inconsistency here. In 1913 and 1914, following outbursts in Mexico during which scores of Americans lost their lives, the United States government warned its citizens to leave that distraught country or remain there at their own risk. This precaution was taken, even though it meant that a number of investors would lose everything, to prevent a few Americans from involving the entire nation in war. If, argued the Germans, the American government had informed its citizens that they could enter the Mexican war zone only at their own risk, why could it not issue a similar warning regarding the German war zone? [49]

It is not true, as has been alleged, that if the Americans on the *Lusitania* had canceled their passages they would have been forced to wait an inconveniently long period for a neutral ship. The American Line was operating vessels practically every week from New York. They did not carry munitions during the neutrality period and they were conspicuously advertised as flying the American flag. One of these liners, the *New York,* was scheduled to sail only two hours after the departure of the *Lusitania,* and for the same port, Liverpool. Furthermore, the records of the company show that the *New York* had room for 300 more passengers, or all of the 197 Americans who departed on

[47] *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan,* by himself and his wife, Mary Baird Bryan (Chicago, 1925), pp. 396, 397. See similar statements of Senator Stone, of Missouri, Senator Jones, of Washington, Vice-President Marshall, and A. Mitchell Palmer. New York *Times,* May 9, 11, 1915.

[48] Bryan, *Memoirs,* p. 403; New York *Times,* June 10, 1915.

[49] Gerard to Bryan (telegram), May 19, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* p. 402; New York *Times,* May 9, 1915. Ambassador Gerard was but one of a number of men in public life who expressed the following thought: "Anyway, when Americans have reasonable opportunity to cross the ocean why should we enter a great war because some American wants to cross on a ship where he can have a private bathroom. . . ." Gerard to Lansing (telegram), July 5, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* p. 461.

the *Lusitania.* The accommodations on the American liner were not so luxurious as those on the Cunarder, for the *Lusitania* was the largest and swiftest vessel then on the transatlantic run, but they were both comfortable and respectable.[50] In other words, for the sake of a little more luxury and the saving of a few hours of time, to say nothing of such trivial reasons as desiring to be with friends, the American passengers disregarded pointed warnings and ventured into the danger zone.[51]

After the disaster several of the survivors stated that they had sailed on the *Lusitania* because they were convinced that the Germans would sink an American as readily as a British liner. Yet on February 20, 1915, shortly after the war zone proclamation, Ambassador Gerard wired the State Department that the German admiralty had asked him for silhouettes and other descriptive data regarding the American liners entering the war zone so as to ensure against their being sunk by mistake. Such a step had doubtless been prompted to some extent by the fact that British merchantmen, including the *Lusitania,* had been making a practice of flying the American flag.[52] Gerard reported that he had supplied information concerning the arrival and departure of ships of the American Line, as well as silhouettes, among which he included the *New York.*[53] It would seem as if the State Department might well have given effective publicity to this evidence of a willingness on the part of the German government to avoid sinking American vessels.

There were many complaints to the effect that if the Cunard company had taken reasonable precautions the disaster would not have occurred. It appears that neither the *Lusitania's* officers nor the shipping circles in Liverpool were particularly alarmed over the published warning, which

[50] See the advertisement which appeared below that of the Cunard company in the New York *Times,* May 1, 1915. The information regarding munitions and passengers was provided by the General Passenger Traffic Manager of the International Mercantile Marine Company, which managed the American Line, in letters of September 20 and November 17, 1933.

[51] Following the tragedy several persons reported that for this voyage, as well as for a previous voyage, they had become sufficiently alarmed to transfer from the *Lusitania* to the *New York.* New York *Times,* May 8, 9, 11, 1915.

[52] Early in February, 1915, the *Lusitania* had raised the American flag when she approached the submarine zone. This incident caused a considerable amount of comment in both England and America, and great indignation in Germany, where it was felt that the Cunarder had resorted to an illegal device to avoid destruction. But since international law has long sanctioned the display of false colors by merchantmen seeking to elude the enemy, the use of the American flag on an earlier voyage could scarcely be construed as giving Germany legal grounds for sinking the *Lusitania* without warning.

[53] Gerard to Lansing (telegram), Feb. 20, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* p. 121.

was regarded as both a bluff and as one more attempt to injure British shipping.[54] After the loss of his vessel, Captain Turner was summoned before the wreck commissioner, and it was revealed that he had been instructed by the admiralty to steer a mid-channel course and to avoid headlands (near which submarines usually lurked); to proceed at a high speed; and to zigzag. In all these particulars he had disregarded orders. When torpedoed, he was steaming along the usual course, about a dozen miles off the Old Head of Kinsale. He explained this by saying that it was necessary to approach land and take bearings before proceeding any farther up St. George's Channel. He had reduced his speed from twenty-one to eighteen knots, in order, so he claimed, not to arrive off Liverpool too soon and be forced to wait outside the bar for the tide while exposed to submarine attack. It was pointed out at the hearings, however, that he could have accomplished the same result by proceeding at high speed on a roundabout course. And, finally, Captain Turner confessed that he had misread his orders, despite their explicitness, to mean that he was to zigzag only when he sighted an enemy submarine.[55] This was a fatal error.

A number of the American survivors attributed much of the loss of life to incompetence on the part of officers and crew after the torpedo had struck. There was, of course, a great deal of confusion, some of which was perhaps due to the fact that there had been only one boat drill on the voyage, despite requests from the passengers for special training.[56] The crew was admittedly below prewar standards because many of the younger men had been called to the colors. Other charges had to do with open portholes, inadequate equipment, and unwise orders. These matters were all examined at length by the Mersey Commission, which sat in 1915, and by the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York, which, in 1918, passed upon the sixty-seven consolidated damage actions brought against the Cunard line; and both of these tribunals, which abundantly reflected the prevailing war spirit, absolved the company of negligence in handling the ship. As for Captain Turner's disregard of orders, the time-honored dictum was invoked that the commander's judgment regarding a given situation must take precedence over blanket instructions. The report of the Mersey Com-

[54] London *Times*, May 3, 1915; New York *Times*, May 8, 1915; New York *Sun*, May 9, 1915; 251 *Fed. Reporter* 721; Viereck, p. 64; Frost, pp. 186–187. A Cunard official in New York reported that the line had already been threatened with advertisements that would hurt its business if it did not pay blackmail. New York *Times*, May 1, 1915.

[55] *Mersey Hearings*, pp. 2 ff.

[56] New York *Times*, May 10; June 17, 1915.

mission, however, was indignantly received by a number of the American survivors, who insisted that it was a "whitewash".[57]

It was widely felt, both in England and in America, that the British authorities were guilty of criminal negligence in permitting the tragedy to occur. The first lord of the admiralty, Winston Churchill, later admitted that the warning advertisement was a matter of "general knowledge" before the disaster.[58] Yet no precautions were taken except to send almost a dozen wireless messages of direction and warning (including general reports of the sinkings of the *U 20*) to the approaching *Lusitania* on May 6 and 7[59]—communications which led to the German charge that the vessel was not being operated by the Cunard company at all but by the British admiralty.[60] A number of passengers appear to have embarked on the *Lusitania* with the expectation and even with assurances that a convoy would be provided when the danger zone was reached. But despite the fact that there were several available destroyers at nearby Queenstown no such protection was forthcoming.[61] When Churchill was charged with remissness, he replied that since it was impossible to provide protection for all British merchantmen, the admiralty had adopted the general policy of convoying none. Concentration of energy for war purposes and the avoidance of charges of discrimination obviously dictated such a policy. Yet there were many who felt with the London *Morning Post* that since the Germans had apparently announced their intention through a published notice of "getting" the pride of Britain's merchant fleet, the admiralty would have been justified in making an exception in this one instance. In support of such a contention it may be observed that Churchill, under persistent questioning, admitted on the floor of the House of Commons that the admiralty had sent out convoys on two different occasions to bring in British freighters laden with American horses.[62]

Whatever the basis for the charges against both the Cunard company and the admiralty, the fact remains that the *Lusitania* was doing almost everything possible to make easier her destruction. On a clear day she

[57] 251 *Fed. Reporter* 728. New York *Times*, July 18, 1915.

[58] *Parl. Debates* (Commons), 5th ser., vol. LXXI, col. 1361.

[59] 251 *Fed. Reporter* 722; Winston S. Churchill, *The World Crisis, 1915* (New York, 1923), II, 347.

[60] See Viereck's statement in the New York *Times*, May 9, 1915.

[61] Lauriat, p. 6; New York *Times*, May 10, June 15, 1915. See the ambiguous assurances of a Cunard official in *ibid.*, May 1, 1915. Corbett, II, 393.

[62] *Parl. Debates* (Commons), 5th ser., vol. LXXI, cols. 1361–1362. *Morning Post*, quoted in the *Outlook*, May 19, 1915, p. 112.

was steaming at reduced speed; she was following her usual course; she was near what was known to be a submarine infested headland; she was not in mid-channel; she was not zigzagging; and she was without armed escort. The admiralty probably reasoned that the Germans were incapable of sinking so swift a vessel, or that they had neither the effrontery nor the stupidity to outrage world opinion by destroying so many innocent noncombatants. In fact, the German foreign office accused the Cunard company of deliberately carrying American passengers in order that they might serve as living shields for cargoes of munitions, and the German view was that Americans could not legitimately expect immunity while lending themselves to such a scheme.[63] A more serious charge was that the British government made no effort to protect the *Lusitania* because it hoped that her destruction would force the United States into the war. This view was widely held by the Germans, and was even communicated to Ambassador Gerard by the Kaiser.[64] No evidence has ever been presented to support the theory.

In the light of the facts herein presented it becomes less difficult to understand why the German government believed that it was acting "in just self-defense" when it sought "to protect the lives of its soldiers by destroying ammunition destined for the enemy with the means of war at its command".[65] The Germans felt that if international law did not justify them in what they did, in spite of the living screen of noncombatants and neutrals who had been warned, something was wrong with international law, and that the alternative was to modify it just as the Allies were doing. But Great Britain, although admitting that the "peculiar" or "novel" conditions of the war made it necessary for her to employ "exceptional measures", was unwilling to accord the same privilege to the Germans in their submarine warfare on merchantmen, insisting that the enemy modifications of international law, strikingly demonstrated in the case of the *Lusitania,* were so ruthless and inhuman as to be inadmissible. This was the view of millions, perhaps the majority, of Americans, to say nothing of other neutrals. They believed that, whatever technical grounds might be advanced by way of justification, the torpedoing of the *Lusitania* was the cold-blooded mass murder

[63] Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, July 8, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* pp. 420, 465. This charge, repeatedly made, cannot be proved. It is clear, however, that the British were not displeased that Americans should want to travel on their ships, and no effort appears to have been made to discourage them from doing so.

[64] Gerard to Lansing (telegram), May 6, 1916, *For. Rel., 1916 Suppl.,* p. 260. See also New York *Times,* May 11, 1915.

[65] Von Jagow to Gerard, May 28, 1915, *For. Rel., 1915 Suppl.,* p. 420.

of 1198 unoffending and helpless men, women, children, and babies. They were convinced that no interpretation or modification of international law should ever permit the sinking of passenger ships without warning because such an act was a violation of the rights of humanity.

The present discussion is concerned with the actual facts of the disaster rather than with diplomacy or international law. This much, however, may be said. If we leave out of consideration the question of reprisals and assume that the *Lusitania* was not a warship, her sinking appears to have been a clear violation of the law of nations. But whether or not her destruction was a justified reprisal for the Allied attempt to starve out Germany is a matter over which the authorities are divided, depending to a considerable extent upon their nationality and their sympathy or lack of sympathy with the cause of the Central Powers.[66] And whether or not the *Lusitania* was a man-of-war will depend in large measure upon how one is disposed to interpret the facts here presented, a decision which will be to some extent affected by the subjective factors just mentioned. Since, then, there is no international tribunal for passing upon such questions, and since the authorities are in disagreement and doubtless always will be, the legal aspects of the case probably will never be settled to the satisfaction of everyone concerned.

[66] The attempt to starve a belligerent population by means of a legal blockade is not a violation of international law. But the Germans maintained that the so-called British blockade was illegal; and they later argued that the sinking of the *Lusitania* was a legitimate reprisal for the prior British violation of international law. A number of the best authorities (American and British) are agreed that a reprisal, to be permissible, must be a retortion in kind and that it must not involve neutrals. The *Lusitania* disaster did affect neutrals, and (the Allies claimed) was so ruthless and undiscriminating a slaughter of noncombatants as not to constitute a legitimate reprisal for the slow starvation of a civilian population—a process which would cease whenever the Germans were disposed to surrender. The German foreign office finally admitted (Feb. 4, 1916) that "retaliation must not aim at other than enemy subjects" and agreed to make pecuniary reparation for the loss of American citizens on the *Lusitania*. *Ibid., 1916 Suppl.*, p. 157. This concession, however, was to some extent dictated by the necessity of mollifying the United States and probably did not represent the convictions of the Germans. In a report of Privy Councilor Kriege, which contains what is probably the best case that can be made out for Germany on the grounds of reprisal, it is argued that neutrals, by acquiescing in British violations of international law, could properly be included in German measures of reprisal. See *Völkerrecht im Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 1927), vol. IV, ser. III, sec. 3. There is, in fact, something to be said for the German contention that the Americans were at fault in passively submitting to the restrictions established by the British war zone while ignoring or trying to force their way through the German submarine zone. Of the numerous monographs written by German investigators that by Friedrich Lützow, *Der Lusitania-Fall* (Leipzig, 1921) is the most useful. A recent and able presentation of the German point of view by a recognized authority is Arno Spindler, "The 'Lusitania' Case", in the *Berliner Monatshefte*, May, 1935, pp. 402–410.

But the discussion of legal justification is largely academic. The supreme objective in war is victory; and the acid test of any measure is its contribution to that end. It is true that the 4200 cases of ammunition never reached England. But the terrible inhumanity of the *Lusitania* disaster shocked the civilized world; added immeasurably to the moral fervor of the Allied cause; alienated a vast amount of sympathy for the Central Powers, particularly in America; caused the almost complete collapse of the German propaganda campaign in the United States; gave a strong impetus to the American preparedness movement; and, though not directly responsible for the entrance of the United States into the war, contributed powerfully to the inflamed state of mind which made possible the final break. Even military necessity could hardly justify the results.

THOMAS A. BAILEY.

Stanford University.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

That Noble Dream

In a thought-provoking paper read at the last meeting of the American Historical Association Mr. Theodore Clarke Smith laid his colleagues under a deep obligation.[1] His essay is not only significant for its intrinsic merits; it indicates an interest in problems of historiography that have been long neglected. If it had been merely expository, it might well be accepted without further analysis as opening the way for an extension of thought along the same lines. But it is in spirit and declaration challenging as well as descriptive, monitory as well as narrative. Mr. Smith makes a division between scholars affiliated with the Association. He insists that they must be, broadly speaking, grouped under two banners and that there is a gulf between them which cannot be bridged. One group, with which he ranges himself, had "a noble dream", and produced sound, creditable, and in many cases masterly works on American history. Although he does not say that the opposition is ignoble, unsound, discreditable, and weak, that implication lurks in the dichotomy which he makes.

The issues presented by Mr. Smith transcend personalities and call for the most thoughtful consideration that the intelligence of the Association can bring to bear upon them. Is there in fact a deep-seated division in the Association? Has a battle line been drawn in such a fashion that members must align themselves on the one side or the other? Is it impossible to find a synthesis that will reconcile apparent contradictions or suggest a suspension of judgment, at least for the time being? Are the facts employed by Mr. Smith to illustrate his thesis so precisely accurate in every case as to be beyond amendment in a quest for "objective truth"? Surely these questions are of more than passing importance. They concern the young members of the Association and the fate of the society. They invite us to stop for a moment to review the assumptions on which historical work is to be done in the future; and perhaps answers to them may reveal some overarching hypothesis or suggest a healing diffidence, at least.

The division which Mr. Smith makes in the Association seems to be positive and sharp. On the one side are the scholars who have made

[1] *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 439-449.

"the impressive output of sound, creditable, and in many cases masterly, works on American history during the period under review" [1884–1934]. The works of this class of scholars "are dominated, from monograph to many-volumed work, by one clear-cut ideal—that presented to the world first in Germany and later accepted everywhere, the ideal of the effort for objective truth". Theirs was "a noble dream", now threatened with extinction, and the hope is expressed that members of this school may go down, if necessary, "with our flags flying". "In that case, it will be time for the American Historical Association to disband, for the intellectual assumptions on which it is founded will have been taken away from beneath it." Here then is a clear-cut ideal, a noble dream, and the American Historical Association was "founded" on it. And who are the men who threaten this ideal, dream, and Association? They are writers who do not "consider it necessary to be impartial or even fair". They are partial and doctrinaire. Especially doctrinaire are those who resort to an economic interpretation of history. Among the menaces to the old and true faith, mentioned by Mr. Smith, is James Harvey Robinson who once flatly declared that what is called "objective history" is simply history without an object, and proposed that historical knowledge be used to throw light on "the quandaries of our life today"—to facilitate "readjustment and reform". Here are the contending parties of light and darkness.

The dichotomy so presented seems to involve ideal, method, and belief in the possibility of achievement. Scholars of the Old Guard desired above all things to search for "objective truth". Were the men whom Mr. Smith puts on the other side of the fence opposed to the ideal of the search for truth? Is the scholar who seeks knowledge useful to contemporaries wrestling with "the quandaries of our life today" unconcerned about the truth of that knowledge? His end may be different but surely he does not seek falsehood or believe that false history can be serviceable to the cause posited. Nor can it be said that the student who tries to penetrate the pageant of politics to the economic interests behind the scenes is necessarily hostile to the ideal of the search for truth. Conceivably he might be as much interested in truth as the scholar who ignores or neglects the economic aspects of history. As far as method goes, those scholars who are placed in opposition to the noble dream may be as patient in their inquiries and as rigorous in their criticism and use of documentation as the old masters of light and leading. In intentions and methods, therefore, no necessary antagonism appears to arise.

Now we come to achievement—to the possibility of finding and

stating the objective truth of history. Here we encounter something more difficult to fathom than intentions or methods. We encounter questions which run deeply into the nature of the human mind, the substance of history as actuality, and the power of scholarship to grasp history objectively. Beyond doubt, scholars of competence can agree on many particular truths and on large bodies of established facts. But is it possible for men to divest themselves of all race, sex, class, political, social, and regional predilections and tell the truth of history as it actually was? Can Mr. Smith's noble dream, his splendid hope, be realized in fact? That is the fundamental issue at stake.

This theory that history as it actually was can be disclosed by critical study, can be known as objective truth, and can be stated as such, contains certain elements and assumptions. The first is that history (general or of any period) has existed as an object or series of objects outside the mind of the historian (a *Gegenüber* separated from him and changing in time). The second is that the historian can face and know this object or series of objects and can describe it as it objectively existed.[2] The third is that the historian can, at least for the purposes of research and writings, divest himself of all taint of religious, political, philosophical, social, sex, economic, moral, and aesthetic interests, and view this *Gegenüber* with strict impartiality, somewhat as the mirror reflects any object to which it is held up. The fourth is that the multitudinous events of history as actuality had some structural organization through inner (perhaps causal) relations, which the impartial historian can grasp by inquiry and observation and accurately reproduce or describe in written history. The fifth is that the substances of this history can be grasped in themselves by purely rational or intellectual efforts, and that they are not permeated by or accompanied by anything transcendent—God, spirit, or materialism. To be sure the theory of objective history is not often so fully stated, but such are the nature and implications of it.[3]

This theory of history and of human powers is one of the most sweeping dogmas in the recorded history of theories. It condemns philosophy and throws it out of doors. As practiced, it ignores problems of mind with which philosophers and theologians have wrestled for centuries and have not yet settled to everybody's satisfaction. As developed

[2] If the historian could do this, then so far as he covers the past there would be nothing left for posterity to do. The task of writing the history of countries and periods could be definitively discharged. To that extent students would have no work before them except that of reading the masters. A new historical treatment of an age would be as unthinkable as a new multiplication table.

[3] Karl Heussi, *Die Krisis des Historismus* (Tübingen, 1932), pp. 1-21.

into Historicism (it may be well to Anglicize *Historismus*), it takes on all the implications of empiricism, positivism, and, if not materialism, at least that rationalism which limits history to its purely experiential aspects. If sound and appealing, it is nonetheless an all-embracing philosophy of historiography, even though it denies philosophy.

Although Ranke contributed powerfully to the growth of this historical theory, and claimed to be writing history as it actually had been, he did not in fact follow the logic of his procedure to its empirical conclusion. He opposed the philosophic method of Hegel—that powerful thinker who boldly attempted to grasp the scheme entire—and at the same time Ranke conceived history as, in some strange manner, "a revelation of God". But he did not openly employ this belief in selecting and arranging "objectively" the facts of history as it actually had been. He did not think that man could know God as history, but he imagined that man could see "God's finger" in human affairs and dimly grasp God's handiwork in history. In history, as Ranke conceived it, God stood there, "wie eine heilige Hieroglyphe, an seinem Äussersten aufgefasst und bewahrt".[4] History was "der Gang Gottes in der Welt". In the true spirit of Lutheran piety, Ranke flung himself down before the impenetrable mystery of things: "Allgewaltiger, Einer und Dreifaltiger, du hast mich aus dem Nichts gerufen. Hier liege ich vor deines Thrones Stufen." Yet he fain would write history, so enclosed in mystery, as it actually had been, impartially, from the critical study of written documents. He rejected philosophy, proclaimed positive history, and still was controlled by a kind of *Pantheismus*.

Ranke could write history, certainly, with a majestic air of impartiality and say that he had written as it actually had been. For example, he could write of popes in a manner pleasing to both Catholics and Protestants of the upper classes. He doubtless believed that he was telling this history of the popes as it actually had been. Did he realize his claim? There is stark validity in the Jesuit objection that Ranke avoided the chief actuality of the story: Was the papacy actually what it affirmed itself to be, "an institution of the Son of God made man", or was it a combination of false claims, craft, and man-made power?[5] How could Ranke avoid that question and yet even claim to be writing history as it actually was?

I make no pretensions to knowing Ranke as he actually was or his

[4] Friedrich Meinecke, *Die Idee der Staatsräson* (Munich, 3d ed., 1929), pp. 469 ff.

[5] Benedetto Croce, *History: its Theory and Practice* (New York, 1921), p. 300. *"Tertium non datur."*

motives in writing the kind of history he chose to write. But records are available to establish the fact that he did not abstain entirely from those hot political controversies which are supposed to warp the pure thought of the empirical historian. In directing the *Historisch-Politische Zeitschrift* he chose a way between French constitutionalism and that extreme Prussian conservatism which would yield not a point to democratic aspirations. After the July Revolution Ranke favored a confederate law against the political press and political literature—a proposition that must have pleased Metternich and Gentz, who opened their archives to him.[6] After the March upheaval of 1848 Ranke came vigorously to the support of Frederick William IV in resistance to popular demands for a constitution based on democratic principles. On this occasion the "impartial" historian proved to be a bulwark for Prussian authoritarianism—against which so many "impartial" historians in the United States wrote vigorously in 1917–1918. Ranke also rejoiced in the events of 1870–1871 "as the victory of conservative Europe over the Revolution", showing that he could not completely separate his political from his historical conceptions. Persistently neglecting social and economic interests in history, successfully avoiding any historical writing that offended the most conservative interests in the Europe of his own time, Ranke may be correctly characterized as one of the most "partial" historians produced by the nineteenth century.

Whether Ranke was fully conscious of what he was doing himself, he was able to see that other historians were writing from some angle of vision. He once said to George Bancroft: "I tell my hearers, that your history is the best book ever written from the democratic point of view. You are thoroughly consistent; adhere strictly to your method, carry it out in many directions but in all with fidelity, and are always true to it." In making this statement, Ranke expressed the hope that it would not make Bancroft angry.[7] Bancroft was not certain that this was "high praise". Shortly afterward he declared: "I deny the charge; if there is democracy in history it is not subjective, but objective as they say here, and so has necessarily its place in history and gives its colour as it should. . . ." Is it possible that Ranke, who was quick to discover subjective ideas in Bancroft's writings, was totally unaware of the fact that he might be writing from the point of view of the conservative reaction in Europe? If he never applied the criterion to himself, then he was

[6] *Historische Zeitschrift*, XCIII, 78.

[7] M. A. DeWolfe Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft* (New York, 1908), II, 183.

doubly "partial" and utterly devoid of any sense for reality and humor.

If, as Mr. Smith says, the "objective" method of Ranke and his school was "accepted everywhere", it is due to history as it was to record that the conception was subjected all along to a running fire of criticism by German historians, even by those "von Fach". Leaving aside the penetrating skepticism of Schopenhauer (who certainly was no mean thinker) and the critique of Eugen Dühring, we find searching examinations of the theory and logic of Historicism by German scholars in the early issues of the *Historische Zeitschrift,* and in the writings of Droysen, Ottokar Lorenz, Bernheim, and Lamprecht, for instance.[8] There were not wanting at that time historians "die in naiver, selbstgewisser Technik ihre Historie trieben, ohne zu ahnen, an welchen theoretischen Abgründen sie sich bewegten"; but many German scholars early went behind Ranke's formula and challenged its validity. They did this long before a host of critical thinkers fell upon it during the opening years of the twentieth century.

And if the Ranke formula or theory of history was accepted in the United States by members of the American Historical Association, as Mr. Smith states, it is not quite in line with the facts in the case to say that it was "everywhere" accepted. Was it in reality adopted as the official creed of the Association in the good old days before ignoble, doctrinaire, and partial students appeared upon the scene? Surely the creed was never drawn up and signed by all faithful members. Whether the majority were acquainted with the philosophical discussion that had long raged around it and threw themselves positively on the Ranke side seems to be a statistical problem not yet solved. Hence judgment should be suspended.

Pending the determination of this historical fact by research, one item in the story may be cited—the presidential address delivered at the opening session of the American Historical Association in 1884 by Andrew D. White. Ranke was yet living. Did Mr. White commit himself or the Association to Historicism or the Ranke formula? Emphatically, he did not, as any member can discover by reading again that noteworthy address. In fact Mr. White, with mature wisdom, recognized both sides of the problem of historiography: the special, the detailed, the verified, the documented—and the philosophical. He said categorically: "While acknowledging the great value of special investigations . . . to historical

[8] Heussi, p. 24. On Ranke's substitution of Universal History for the Philosophy of History, Henri Sée remarks: "Conception, qui, aujourd'hui, nous parait de pensée assez pauvre, depuis que l'horizon de l'historien s'est singulièrement élargi." *Science et philosophie de l'histoire* (2d ed., Paris, 1933), pp. 20-21; citing Ernst Troeltsch, *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (Vol. III, *Gesammelte Schriften,* Tübingen, 1922).

knowledge in individual nations, it is not too much to say that the highest effort and the noblest result toward which these special historical investigations lead is the philosophical synthesis of all special results in a large, truth-loving, justice-loving spirit."

"Bearing on this point, Buckle, in a passage well worthy of meditation, has placed *observation* at the foot of the ladder, *discovery* next above it, and *philosophical method* at the summit." In this spirit Mr. White declared that at the annual meetings of the Association there ought to be a session or sessions dealing with special studies, and also a session or sessions "devoted to general history, the history of civilization, and the philosophy of history". He recognized the dangers of the latter—"looseness and vagueness"—but thought that the consideration of both aspects of history would contribute to a sounder development of each. "These difficulties", Mr. White warned us, "the Association must meet as they arise."[9]

Nor did the first President, Andrew D. White, see in the use of history as an instrument of "social control" the perils to scholarship lamented by Mr. Smith. On the contrary, Mr. White closed with an exordium in line with the thought later expressed by James Harvey Robinson, whose ideal Mr. Smith puts on the other side of the fence from "a noble dream". Mr. White proposed no neutral, value-free history. "Certainly", he said near the close of his address, "a confederation like this—of historical scholars . . . ought to elicit most valuable work in both fields [special and philosophical], and to contribute powerfully to the healthful development on the one hand of man as man, and on the other to the opening up of a better political and social future for the nation at large." This is asking historians to do what James Harvey Robinson suggested: bring historical knowledge to bear "on the quandaries of our life today".

Henry Adams was also once President of the American Historical Association. He cannot be placed among those who have recently invaded the circle of the pure faith and threatened to destroy the Association by "the final extinction of a noble dream", driving Mr. Smith and his adherents to consider the frightful alternative of going down "with our flags flying". Did Henry Adams limit the function and thought of the historian to Historicism, the Ranke formula, or neutrality in the face of life's exigent forces? Members who care to know before they take sides in a discussion of the theory of history must read the letter which Henry Adams, as President of the Association, wrote to his col-

[9] American Historical Association, *Papers*, I, 49-72.

leagues as long ago as 1894.[10] There he invited the members to consider what a science of history would look like and the devastating challenge which it would make to the church, the state, property, or labor. Mr. Adams, with amazing foresight, predicted a crisis in Western economy and thought, and warned his colleagues that they "may at any time in the next fifty years be compelled to find an answer, 'Yes' or 'No', under the pressure of the most powerful organizations the world has ever known for the suppression of influences hostile to its safety".

One more colleague may be mentioned. Mr. Smith has referred to H. L. Osgood as holding to the "high ideals" of the school which now seems to be threatened by doctrinaire writers. Mr. Osgood was, as Mr. Smith says, expository, analytical, and for the most part impersonal. Did Mr. Osgood imagine himself to be writing history as it actually was? His ambition was more limited. He sought to tell the truth, as best he could, about certain aspects of history. Did he imagine himself to stand outside the *Zeitgeist?* Not for a moment. Mr. Osgood had been one of my masters, and shortly after I presented him with a copy of my *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* I asked him whether it offended him or appeared to be *ultra vires?* His response was positive. He said in effect: "Men of my generation grew up in the midst of great constitutional and institutional debates and our interest turned to institutional history. Profound economic questions have now arisen and students of the younger generation, true to their age, will occupy themselves with economic aspects of history." Far from deeming this interest reprehensible, Mr. Osgood regarded it as "natural" and proper. Near the end of his life he spoke to me of the heavy hand of time that lies upon all our work, dating us, revealing our limitations.

How many other members of the older generation did in fact think their way through the assumptions and convictions enclosed in Mr. Smith's "noble dream" and accept it whole heartedly? The data for answering that question are not at hand. How many watched carefully the development of the critical attitude toward Historicism in Europe at the turn of the century, and especially after 1914? Materials for answering that query are not available either. Judging by the files of the *American Historical Review* and the programs of annual meetings such philosophical issues have received scant consideration, little exploration and examination. Judging by the writings of American historians slight attention has been given to the intellectual problems involved in the

[10] *Ibid., Annual Report,* 1894, pp. 17-23. Reprinted in *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* (New York, 1920), pp. 125 ff.

choice of subjects, the selection of facts, and the construction of monographs and many-volumed works. If there has been any real searching of historical minds and hearts in the United States, any fearless and wide-reaching inquiry into preliminary assumptions, tacit or deliberate, any procedure save on the level of ingenuous convictions, historical literature bears only a few evidences of its fruits. If engines of skepticism and verification have been mercilessly applied to what passes for constructive thought, as distinguished from eclecticism and documentation, news of the fact has not spread far and wide enough in the American Historical Association to make a profound impression upon its proceedings. Some countervailing evidence may be cited, no doubt, but the exceptions would seem merely to prove the rule. It may be that the major portion of American scholars in the good old days imagined that they could discover and know the objective truth of history as it actually was, but there is good reason for thinking that a large number of them did not labor under that impression respecting their activities and powers.

Having indicated some grounds for holding that Historicism is not and never has been "accepted everywhere" as the official creed of the American Historical Association, it is now appropriate to inquire whether the Ranke formula is valid in itself. Can the human mind discover and state the "objective truth" of history as it actually was? Space does not admit even a brief summation of the voluminous literature dealing with this conception and demonstrating, if not its delusive character, its rejection by scholars and thinkers of high competence in Europe. Those American students who care to examine the history and nature of the European revolt against Historicism may find guidance in Croce, *History: its Theory and Practice,* in Heussi, *Die Krisis des Historismus,* and in the numerous works cited by Heussi as supporting evidence. In these volumes is presented the development of historical thought which culminated in the rejection of the Ranke theory and its formulation as Historicism.

At this point only a bare outline of the argument is possible, but it may be given, very inadequately, in the following propositions:

1. The idea that history took place in the past as actuality outside the mind of the contemporary historian is accepted as the commonsense view.

2. The historian is not an observer of the past that lies beyond his own time. He cannot see it *objectively* as the chemist sees his test tubes and compounds. The historian must "see" the actuality of history through the medium of documentation. That is his sole recourse.

3. The documentation (including monuments and other relics) with which the historian must work covers only a part of the events and personalities that make up the actuality of history. In other words multitudinous events and personalities escape the recording of documentation. To realize the significance of this, as Heussi says, it is only necessary to consider an effort to describe the battle of Leipzig alone, to say nothing of the Napoleonic wars or the history of the Roman Empire.

4. Not only is the documentation partial. In very few cases can the historian be reasonably sure that he has assembled all the documents of a given period, region, or segment. In most cases he makes a partial selection or a partial reading of the partial record of the multitudinous events and personalities involved in the actuality with which he is dealing.

5. Since the history of any period embraces all the actualities involved, and since both documentation and research are partial, it follows that the total actuality is not factually knowable to any historian, however laborious, judicial, or faithful he may be in his procedures. History as it actually was, as distinguished, of course from particular facts of history, is not known or knowable, no matter how zealously is pursued "the ideal of the effort for objective truth".

6. The idea that there was a complete and actual structurization of events in the past, to be discovered through a partial examination of the partial documentation, is pure hypothesis, as Th. Lessing shows in his *Geschichte als Sinngebung des Sinnlosen*.

7. The events and personalities of history in their very nature involve ethical and aesthetic considerations. They are not mere events in physics and chemistry inviting neutrality on the part of the "observer".

8. Any overarching hypothesis or conception employed to give coherence and structure to past events in written history is an interpretation of some kind, something transcendent. And as Croce says, "transcendency is always transcendency, whether it be thought of as that of a God or of reason, of nature, or of matter".

9. The historian seeking to know the past, or about it, does not bring to the partial documentation with which he works a perfect and polished neutral mind in which the past streaming through the medium of documentation is mirrored as it actually was. Whatever acts of purification the historian may perform he yet remains human, a creature of time, place, circumstance, interests, predilections, culture. No amount of

renunciation could have made Andrew D. White into a Frederick Jackson Turner or either of them into a neutral mirror.

10. Into the selection of topics, the choice and arrangement of materials, the specific historian's "me" will enter. It may enter with a conscious clarification of philosophy and purpose or, as Croce says, surreptitiously, without confession or acknowledgment.

11. The validity of the Ranke formula and its elaboration as Historicism is destroyed by internal contradictions and rejected by contemporary thought. The historian's powers are limited. He may search for, but he cannot find, the "objective truth" of history, or write it, "as it actually was".

Now we come to the validity of an antithesis of the Ranke formula—the economic interpretation of history. Is it partial, in the sense that it does not cover all the events of history? It certainly is. Surely none will contend that it could be otherwise than partial in its scope. Is it "the correct" interpretation of history? If the word interpretation is taken to mean "explanation", then neither it nor any other historical hypothesis can be regarded as valid and final, on the ground that in the nature of things—documentation and the human mind—the past as it actually was cannot be known. If the word be taken, however, in a manner equally admissible under linguistic usage, to mean simply the writer's version, construction, or conception of his subject, then an economic interpretation is merely what it professes to be—a version, not the absolute truth, of history.

Seekers after truth in particular and general have less reason to fear it than they have to fear any history that comes under the guise of the Ranke formula or Historicism. It bears its own warning. A book entitled *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution,* like every other book on history, is a selection and an organization of facts; but it serves advance notice on the reader, telling him what to expect. A book entitled *The Formation of the Constitution* or *The Making of the Constitution* is also a selection and organization of facts, hence an interpretation or conception of some kind, but it does not advise the reader at the outset concerning the upshot to be expected.

Does an economic interpretation, open and avowed, violate the "ideal of the effort for objective truth"? Not necessarily. The historian who searches out and orders economic aspects of life, events, and interests may possibly be as zealous in his search for truth as any other historian searching out and ordering his facts in his way. Is the student who seeks an economic interpretation more partial, in the sense of partisan-

ship, or more doctrinaire than the historian, who assumes that he can know the past as it actually has been? Not necessarily. He may conceivably view the structure of classes, their ideologies, formulas, projects, and conflicts as coldly and impartially as any disciple of Ranke that the American Historical Association has furnished.

Did the economic interpretation of history, as Mr. Smith alleges, have "its origin, of course, in the Marxian theories"? I cannot speak for others, but so far as I am concerned, my conception of the economic interpretation of history rests upon documentation older than Karl Marx—Number X of the *Federalist,* the writings of the Fathers of the Republic, the works of Daniel Webster, the treatises of Locke, Hobbes, and Machiavelli, and the *Politics* of Aristotle—as well as the writings of Marx himself.

Yet I freely pay tribute to the amazing range of Marx's scholarship and the penetrating character of his thought. It may be appropriate to remind those who may be inclined to treat Marx as a mere revolutionary or hot partisan that he was more than that. He was a doctor of philosophy from a German university, possessing the hallmark of the scholar. He was a student of Greek and Latin learning. He read, besides German, his native tongue, Greek, Latin, French, English, Italian, and Russian. He was widely read in contemporary history and economic thought. Hence, however much one may dislike Marx's personal views, one cannot deny to him wide and deep knowledge—and a fearless and sacrificial life. He not only interpreted history, as everyone does who writes any history, but he helped to make history. Possibly he may have known something. At least the contemporary student, trying to look coldly and impartially on thought and thinkers in the field of historiography, may learn a little bit, at least, from Karl Marx.

But that does not mean that any economic interpretation of history must be used for the purposes which Marx set before himself. It may well be used for opposite purposes. It has been. It may be again. Or it may be employed as the basis for impartiality and inaction on the ground that a conflict of mere material interests cannot be a matter of concern to virtue itself. In other words there is nothing in the nature of an economic interpretation of history that compels the interpreter to take any partisan or doctrinaire view of the struggle of interests. In fact such an interpretation of the Constitution is less liable to invite a surge of feeling than Mr. Smith's interpretation that the formation and adoption of the Constitution was "a contest between sections ending in the victory of straight-thinking national-minded men over narrower and

more local opponents". An economic interpretation does not inquire whether men were straight-thinking or crooked-thinking. It inquires not into their powers of mind or virtues, but into the nature and effects of their substantial possessions. Nor is it necessarily in conflict with Mr. Smith's conclusions. It pushes the inquiry one step further than he does. It asks how it happened that some men were national-minded and others were local-minded, and perhaps throws some light upon the subject.

What conclusions, then, may be drawn from this excursion, hurried and cursory, into historiography, for members of the American Historical Association? In my opinion, they are as follows: The formula of Ranke and its extension as Historicism do not and have never formed an official creed for the Association. From Andrew D. White down to the present moment there have been members who have believed that the wider and deeper philosophic questions involved in the interpretation of history should be considered as having an importance equal to, if not greater than, the consideration of documentation, special studies, and writings done on the assumption that history "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" can be known and expounded by historians. The Ranke formula and Historicism are not the official creed of the Association and ought not to be, for they now lie amid the ruins of their own defeat. Nor are the other creeds placed in antithesis to the "noble dream" by Mr. Smith deemed official. They should not be. No school that makes pretensions to exclusive omniscience or exclusive virtue, that claims to know history as it actually was can long escape the corroding skepticism that search and thought bring to it. It is undesirable to invite the Association to split over two absolutes. It is not necessary for any member, fraction, or group, however large or small, to feel that a war to the hilt is on and that the one or the other must go down with, or without, "flying colors".

The task before the American Historical Association seems to be something other than that of deepening a division artificially made. The collection, preservation, and publication of archives must be carried on with ever increasing zeal. All the engines of criticism, authentication, and verification, so vigorously used by the German school, must be employed with all the powers of intelligence available. Monographic studies must be promoted. But this is not enough.

The philosophic side of historiography, as Andrew D. White warned the Association, must also receive the consideration required for all constructive work in historical writing. The effort to grasp at the totality

of history must and will be continued, even though the dream of bringing it to earth must be abandoned. This means a widening of the range of search beyond politics to include interests hitherto neglected—economic, racial, sex, and cultural in the most general sense of the term. Certainly by this broadening process the scholar will come nearer to the actuality of history as it has been. The distinction between particular facts that may be established by the scientific method and the "objective" truth of history must be maintained, if illusions are to be dispelled.

Still more pressing, because so generally neglected, is the task of exploring the assumptions upon which the selection and organization of historical facts proceed. In the nature of things they proceed upon some assumptions concerning the substance of history as actuality. We do not acquire the colorless, neutral mind by declaring our intention to do so. Rather do we clarify the mind by admitting its cultural interests and patterns—interests and patterns that will control, or intrude upon, the selection and organization of historical materials. Under what formulas is it possible to conceive history? What types of controlling patterns are to be found in the declarations of historical writers, in the diverse opinions of the world at large, and in the works of historians already before us? Instead of waging a war, followed by victory or defeat, we need to provide for the Association's annual meetings a section or sections dealing with the assumptions and procedures of historiography. What do we think we are doing when we are writing history? What kinds of philosophies or interpretations are open to us? Which interpretations are actually chosen and practiced? And why? By what methods or processes can we hope to bring the multitudinous and bewildering facts of history into any coherent and meaningful whole? Through the discussion of such questions the noble dream of the search for truth may be brought nearer to realization, not extinguished; but in the end the members of the American Historical Association will be human beings, not immortal gods.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

New Milford.

AN EFFORT TO IDENTIFY JOHN WHITE

IN observing the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first English colony within the limits of what is now the United States, the question of the identity of John White once more arises. He appears in the pageant of American history about the year 1584, slips off the stage nine years later, and apparently vanishes. Whence he came,

where he went, and where he died still seem to baffle the investigator. Yet in mute testimony of his service to American history there exist in the British Museum sixty-five exquisite paintings of American Indians, of American flora and fauna, apparently executed on the Roanoke expeditions (*ca.* 1585–1590). These far outclass any other effort at artistic portrayal of the New World by a colonial of any nation before the eighteenth century.

There is no occasion to confuse this John White, however, with his later namesake of Massachusetts.[1] The problem of the identification of the Virginia John White can best be elucidated by the following résumé of the history of the Raleigh Roanoke colonies:

1584. Raleigh sends out Amidas and Barlow, who explore the coast of North Carolina, but plant no colony.

1585. Raleigh sends out Grenville, seven ships and colonists. The Roanoke colony is founded under Governor Lane. Grenville goes back to England, promising to return to Roanoke Island the following year with supplies. A John White, *artist,* paints pictures.

1586. Sir Francis Drake comes to Roanoke Island from the West Indian voyage and takes back to England all but two of the colonists. Grenville reappears after Drake has departed. Leaves fifteen men.

1587. Raleigh sends out three ships, and colonists, under a *governor* named John White. White fails to find the fifteen men left by Grenville the year before. The Roanoke colony is re-established. Virginia Dare is born. *Governor* White goes back to England for more supplies, promising to return the following year.

1588. In this, the year of the Spanish Armada, it was difficult to obtain ships and supplies. Two small relief vessels get only as far as the Madeiras, and are forced to return to England.

1589. Raleigh sells out his interests in the venture to *Governor* John White, Richard Hakluyt, and others. No relief expedition was sent to Roanoke Island in this year.

1590. White goes to Roanoke Island with five ships and colonists. He finds the Island deserted and the word "Croatoan" carved on a tree. Storms prevent searching for the "lost colonists" on Croatan Island. *Governor* White returns to England for the last time.[2]

[1] The subject of this note is to be clearly distinguished from the so-called "Founder of Massachusetts", about whom so much is known. Frances Rose-Troup's 500 page *John White* (New York, 1930) and Samuel Eliot Morison's *Builders of the Bay Colony* (Boston, 1930) leave little to be said. This second John White's dates are 1575-1648—we mention him only to make clear that he is *not* the person of whom we are writing.

[2] After 350 years, the main sources of the story of the Roanoke colony remain those published at the time of the founding of the colony, or shortly thereafter: Thomas Hariot, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1588); Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations* (London, 1589, and London, 1598-1600); Theodore De Bry's English, Latin, French, and German editions of Hariot, illustrated with engravings of a few of John White's paintings (Frankfurt, 1590-1620); Walter Bigges, *Expeditio Francisci Draki* (Leiden, 1588), and its three English translations, entitled *A Summarie and true discourse of*

From the above it would appear that one John White, artist, came out with the Roanoke colony of 1585. He painted some sixty-five pictures of American life. It would also appear that in 1587 and 1590 one John White, governor, came out in charge of the Roanoke colony. Are these two the same man? Very little is known of either. Historians have tended to conclude that they are identical.[3] The first notice the world had of John White as artist was the publication in 1590 of twenty-three of his pictures. These, we are told by the publisher Theodore De Bry, were engraved from some of the original paintings, which apparently Hakluyt induced White to lend to De Bry for the purpose of illustrating the latter's edition of Hariot's *Virginia* of 1590.[4] Here were two maps and twenty-one authentic pictures of American Indians, their life and manners. And what pictures they were, in contrast with the crude, grotesque, and often absurd woodcuts which had illustrated the French and Spanish books on America up to that time! Here in the first English work to describe the first English colony in the New World were pictures, well engraved, based on eyewitness drawings, appealing both in substance and in their artistic merit. No wonder De Bry's illustrated edition of Hariot went through at least seventeen different printings between 1590 and 1620. No wonder illustrators of books, pictures, and maps have continued to plagiarize De Bry's engravings of White's Indians for more than three hundred years.[5]

But the main point is this: De Bry engraved only twenty-five of White's sixty-five paintings,[6] while forty exquisite water colors of specimens in botany, zoology, ichthyology, herpetology, and entomology

Sir F. Drakes West Indian Voyage (London, 1589). The main facts discovered since the sixteenth century are in Francis L. Hawks, *History of North Carolina* (Fayetteville, 1857-1858); the *Transactions* of the American Antiquarian Society, 1860, vol. IV, and *Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War, 1585-1587*, Navy Records Society (London, 1898).

[3] Thomas Seccombe, in the article "John White" in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; Laurence Binyon, "The Drawings of John White, Governor of Raleigh's Virginia Colony", in the *Walpole Society*, XIII, 19–24; and Henry Stevens, *Bibliotheca Historica* (Boston, 1870), pp. 223–226.

[4] See note 2.

[5] *A brief account of Ralegh's Roanoke Colony of 1585, being a guide to an exhibition . . . by the William L. Clements Library* (Ann Arbor, 1935). One of White's figures is here traced through three centuries of engraving.

[6] See the New York *Times*, May 26, 1935, where a newspaper correspondent "discovers" the John White pictures, and then uses as illustrations the same pictures De Bry had used more than three centuries before. Two of the twenty-five De Bry used in Part II, the Lemoyne *Florida*, Part I being Hariot's *Virginia*.

have been ignored.[7] Of these forty, at least thirty-four may well be American.

From 1590 until 1865 John White's water colors were lost to view. Some paintings which looked as though they might have been the John White originals existed in the Sloane collection in the British Museum, but subsequent investigation has shown them to be only poor copies. In 1865 the original paintings came to light, were put up at auction at Sotheby's, were bought by Henry Stevens, and were then sold to the British Museum.[8]

So much for what the world knows or does not know about John White, the artist. He appears to have shipped with the colonists in 1585, and later to have returned to England with the pictures. The fact that a man named John White came out as governor of the Roanoke colony in 1587 and 1590 does not prove the two to have been the same. In 1896 the learned P. Lee Phillips, chief of the Division of Maps in the Library of Congress, threw down the gauntlet, requiring historians to adduce at least some evidence identifying the two John Whites.[9] No one replied to him and many ignored his cogent reasoning. For nearly forty years Phillips's objections to the identification of the two men as the same person have been unanswered. The sources remain those quoted in our footnote (2)—and, as Phillips pointed out, they certainly do not prove the two men to have been the same. Hakluyt has preserved for us rather satisfactory passenger lists of the Roanoke colonists. They do not help. There was no John White left at Roanoke in the winter of 1585–1586. The next John White named is undoubtedly the governor who appears in the 1587 list. If we can only prove that an artist John White was in Roanoke in 1587 when we know that the only John White there was the governor, we shall have some shadow of evidence not heretofore available that the two were one and the same.

Upon the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Roanoke colony, that evidence seems to have come to light. A University of Michigan lexicographer, working in the British Museum, picked up a Latin phrase in the manuscript of Thomas Moffett's work on insects (Sloane MSS. 4014). It read "Hanc è Virginiâ Americanâ

[7] A comparison of Mark Catesby, *Natural History of Carolina* (London, 1754), with John White's paintings might yield some interesting results.

[8] These paintings have been adequately listed and described by Binyon in the *Catalogue of Drawings by British Artists . . . in the Department of Prints . . . in the British Museum* (London, 1907), IV, 326-337, and in the *Walpole Society*, XIII, 19-24.

[9] *Virginia Cartography: a Bibliographical Description* (Washington, 1896), pp. 3–18.

Candidus ad me Pictor detulit 1587". Fortunately the photostat of this phrase which a historical investigator happened to see, included a picture to which the phrase related. One glance at the picture showed it to be a very good painting of the common American tiger swallow-tail butterfly.[10] This brought immediately to his mind that portfolio of the original John White paintings. The identical butterfly is No. 68 in the John White album. The inscription "Virginiâ" could refer in 1587 only to the Roanoke colony; any Latinist will recognize "White" in "Candidus". Here then we have "Candidus Pictor" in 1587 bringing a butterfly from Virginia to Moffett, when the only "Candidus" whom Hakluyt's passenger lists record as being in "Virginia" that year is "Candidus Gubernator". We are grateful to the entomologist Moffett (or to one of his scientist contemporaries who supplied him with material) for so carefully recording the source of his specimen and the date, thus offering a possible identification of John White, artist, as John White, governor.

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS.

The William L. Clements Library.

[10] The butterfly, which appears in Sloane MSS. 4014, was reproduced in the first printing of Moffett's book, *Insectorum . . . Theatrum* (London, 1634), p. 98, and again in the English version of Moffett's work which appears at the end of Edward Topsel's *The History of Four-footed Beasts* (London, 1658), p. 967. In both of these published versions the inscription "Hanc è Virginiâ . . ." is omitted. It appears only in the manuscript, which explains its not being picked up years ago. The type of investigator who might be interested in Moffett's work would probably not be concerned with the historical facts regarding the life of the "first American artist".

DOCUMENTS

Clark—Leyba Papers

FEW phases of United States history have been more carefully studied than the conquest of the Illinois country during the Revolutionary War. Historical material dealing with this subject has been sought with great care, especially that related to the activities of George Rogers Clark. As a result the following statement appears in the preface of Volume VIII of the *Collections* of the Illinois State Historical Library: "The present volume, the third of the Virginia Series, contains all the available Clark papers prior to November, 1781." [1] However, there are certain aspects of the American occupation of Illinois which require further development. Spanish reactions to the war in the West, relations between Clark and Fernando de Leyba, and especially the services of the latter to the United States, are among the topics which need additional investigation.

Only twenty-six days after his arrival at St. Louis to assume the office of lieutenant governor, Leyba began his correspondence with the Americans who had just occupied Cahokia on the opposite side of the Mississippi. Upon his invitation Clark came to St. Louis where he was received with as much ceremony as possible at that frontier post.[2] He remained as a guest in Leyba's home for two days, and a friendship began between the two men which was to be of great importance to the American cause in Illinois. "This gentleman", wrote Clark to Governor Patrick Henry of Virginia, "interests himself much in favor of the States,—more so than I could have expected." [3] Clark showed Leyba a copy of the letter he sent to Congress describing his fine reception in Spanish Illinois, and, thereafter, apparently kept the lieutenant governor well informed of events on the eastern side of the Mississippi.[4] Leyba in turn passed on the information to Governor Bernardo de Gálvez at New Orleans, who by this time made little effort to conceal his aid to the States.

Mindful of his instructions from Gálvez to assist the Americans, Leyba both used his influence and pledged his own credit in order that

[1] *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, James Alton James, ed., p. iii.

[2] Leyba to Gálvez, July 11, 1778, *The Spanish Régime in Missouri*, Louis Houck, ed. (Chicago, 1909), I, 161–162. See letters I, X (hereafter referred to by numbers).

[3] *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 69.

[4] Nos. VIII, X, XV, XVI, and XXII.

Clark might secure supplies for his men. Otherwise Clark would have been in an impossible situation since the financial backing of Virginia was negligible, the supplies purchased by Pollock were inadequate, and the French villages of Illinois were too small and too poor to support the American troops. Most of the inhabitants of the Spanish district were reluctant to give up their goods for Clark's receipts and notes, but did so when the lieutenant governor offered to guarantee payment. Leyba's assistance to the Americans brought him real tragedy, for not only did he lose a large part of his personal fortune in their behalf, but the resulting financial worries also hastened the death of his wife and probably that of himself.[5]

The sacrifices of many of the men who helped finance the American occupation of Illinois are well known,[6] but those of Leyba have scarcely been mentioned by historians, although he was one of the principal characters in that drama. This neglect makes evident an important criticism of most of the works upon Clark and the acquisition of Illinois. Valuable Spanish records pertaining to the subject have been given either little consideration or entirely ignored. With this fact in mind, a few documents bearing upon the topics mentioned have been selected from those in the Papeles de Cuba, Archivo general de Indias, and are presented here. Most of the letters were written either by Clark or Leyba, and all of them are intimately concerned with the American conquest of the Illinois country.[7]

The University of California. LAWRENCE KINNAIRD.

I LEYBA TO BOWMAN [8]

St. Louis, July 6, 1778

Sir:

As I am disposed to render justice in all cases, I have communicated to Mr. Cerré the petition which you have recommended to me in your

[5] Nos. X and XXV; Leyba's instructions, Mar. 9, 1778 (draft), Archivo general de Indias, Papeles de Cuba, legajo 2358.

[6] James G. Randall, "George Rogers Clark's Service of Supply", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, VIII, 256–263; James Alton James, "Oliver Pollock, Financier of the Revolution in the West", *ibid.*, XVI, 70–79; Joseph J. Thompson, "Penalties of Patriotism", Illinois State Historical Society, *Journal*, IX, 401–432; *Cahokia Records, 1778–1790* [Ill. Hist. Coll., Va. ser., vol. I], Clarence Walworth Alvord, ed., p. li; Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West* (New York, 1889–1896), II, 171–173; Justin Winsor, *Westward Movement* (Boston, 1897), p. 121.

[7] Transcripts or photostats of all the original manuscripts, of which the English version is given here, are in Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[8] Archivo general de Indias, Papeles de Cuba, legajo 1. The MS. is in French and is a copy of the letter sent to Bowman. All the documents in the present collection are from this *legajo*, and are in the language of the writer, except where otherwise indicated.

honored letter which has just been given to me.[9] I am sending the petition back to you with the answer of the aforesaid Mr. Cerré.

I congratulate you, Sir, on your happy arrival at the Illinois, as well as on that of Commandant Clarke. I shall be delighted to find the opportunity of proving to both of you the perfect consideration with which I have the honor of being, Sir,

Your most humble and obedient Servant,

LEYBA [rubric]

I enclose herewith a certificate which the aforesaid Mr. Cerré requested of me after giving me his papers.

Mr. Jos. Bowman, Captain.

II LEYBA TO CLARK[10]

St. Louis, July 8, 1778

Sir:

If the affairs of the government, of which I have taken charge only a few days ago, permit me, I shall come in person to congratulate you on your happy arrival at the Kaskaskias. However, I hope you will be good enough to accept my felicitations until such time as I may express my pleasure personally, which will be before long.

I enclose herewith a statement of certain goods turned over by Mr. Pollok of New Orleans which shall be delivered whenever you may be pleased to dispose of them.[11]

I should be flattered to be able to be useful to you so as to prove to you the perfect consideration with which I have the honor of being,

Sir, Your most humble and obedient Servant,

LEYBA [rubric]

Mr. Clarke.[12]

III LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis, July 11, 1778

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

The last of April of the present year Don Jorge Roger Clark, colonel for the United States of America left Forduquens[13] with a detachment of five hundred men with the intention of taking possession of the part

[9] For information concerning the case of Gabriel Cerré, consult *Kaskaskia Records, 1778–1790* [Ill. Hist. Coll., Va. ser., vol. II], Clarence Walworth Alvord, ed., pp. 48–49; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 48, 228–229, 235–237; no. III.

[10] In French, a copy of the letter sent to Clark.

[11] Oliver Pollock, a wealthy American merchant of New Orleans, became commercial agent for the United States and also for the State of Virginia at that place during the Revolutionary War. His work in supplying and financing the American forces in the West at the sacrifice of his fortune contributed greatly to Clark's success in holding the Illinois country. For bibliographical note on Pollock, see Lawrence Kinnaird, "American Penetration into Spanish Louisiana", *New Spain and the Anglo-American West: Historical Contributions*, presented to Herbert Eugene Bolton (Los Angeles, 1932), vol. I, p. 213, n. 4.

[12] For Clark's reply to Leyba, see A. P. Nasatir, "The Anglo-Spanish Frontier", Illinois State Historical Society, *Journal*, XXI, 100.

[13] Fort Duquesne.

of the Ylinueses that is subject to the orders of Mr. de Rochblau.[14] This expedition was made on boats by *la bella Rivera*.[15] Twenty-five leagues before this unites with the Misisipi at a place called the Tavern, the said leader landed with his second-in-command, Colonel William Linn, a sergeant major, five captains, several subalterns, and two hundred and eighty soldiers. Traveling five days through the forest they reached Oca[16] at two in the morning of the fifth of the present month. (The rest of the detachment stayed to bring the boats and the sick to the same place and should arrive very soon.) This laborious trip was made through the forest so that Mr. de Rochblau should not get away from them.

The commanding colonel arrived at this town in hunting shirt and breechcloth, naked of foot and limb and with his bed, food, and gun on his shoulder. The troops had no other equipment than breechcloth, powder horn, gun, and knapsack. They went at once to Mr. de Rochblau's house, and having surrounded it, called him to the door which was opened for them immediately. Seizing the said Rochblau they put handcuffs and shackles on him. They told his anxious wife to get together her clothing and ordered one of her slaves to wait on her since the rest and all other persons were made prisoners. On this occasion Mr. Rochblau showed his firmness and intelligence. As soon as he found himself loaded with irons, he said to the American commander and the other officers, "I am in your hands; do what you want with me; the fear of death will not make me change my way of thinking. The King of Great Britain is my sovereign and I have given him my oath of allegiance. If I had not sacrificed my person and my property in his service, I should suffer the greatest remorse of conscience. I have put into execution whatever appeared to me favorable to the royal cause and contrary to yours. I have only one regret and that is that my power was not great enough to be able to destroy you. This regret is even greater now when I see myself with my hands tied, not because of pride but because I find them powerless to work in the defense of my sovereign."

In the meantime the town began to be filled with excitement, but the American soldiers shouted that all should keep quiet and they would harm no one. The following day they collected all the firearms which were in the place and forced the citizens to take the oath of allegiance. They did the same in the town of Kao to which a captain went at once with 32 men. The

[14] Illinois, with marginal note: "Belonging to his Britannic Majesty". Philippe de Rastel, chevalier de Rocheblave, had been an officer in the French army during the Seven Years' War. After the war he entered British service and was appointed commandant of Kaskaskia in 1776. *Kaskaskia Records*, pp. 4, n. 5, pp. 5–6; James Alton James, *The Life of George Rogers Clark* (Chicago, 1928), pp. 109–111.

[15] The Ohio River.

[16] Colonel William Linn accompanied Clark's force as a volunteer (*Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 239–240). Joseph Bowman in a letter to John Hite, December 29, 1778, asserted that the men in the Kaskaskia expedition were "about 170 or 180 in number". In a letter to Brinker, July 30, 1778, Bowman wrote that Clark set out "with about 175 men". James Alton James, the leading authority on Clark, stated that the force consisted of 175 men. Clark himself wrote to O'Hara that he had 180 men. These men were divided into four companies commanded respectively by Joseph Bowman, John Montgomery, Leonard Helm, and William Harrod. William Hayden English, *Conquest of the Country Northwest of the River Ohio, 1778–1783* (Indianapolis, 1896), I, 558, 564; James, *George Rogers Clark*, p. 117; no. IV. Oca was Kaskaskia.

chief object of sending this party so promptly was to go in pursuit of a merchant named Mr. Serret, whose house and goods were seized at the same time as those of Mr. de Rochblau, whose intimate friend he was; but they could not bring about his arrest because the said Serret had come to this town under my command an hour before the party in pursuit of him arrived. For indeed he was ignorant of all these happenings, but that fact did not cause him regret.[17]

On the 6th the above-mentioned captain wrote me to arrest him. I replied to this letter on the same date.[18] On the 7th he again wrote me telling me that he would spend the 8th in visiting me. He did so in order to discuss Mr. Serret's affairs. The reason for pursuing him, although he is a declared royalist, is not because of that fact, since they know that in Spanish territory he would go free on the charges they could bring against him on that point. It is about a large inheritance of which he is trustee and should give account to the heirs. When I was informed of all this, I offered to prosecute Mr. Serret's case, taking his accounts and handing them over to the heirs. The English [19] captain had agreed to this when one of those accompanying him, who was of the party opposed to Mr. Serret, said that it would be better for him to go to the other side since they had witnesses and legal means there to end this suit speedily; but he would have to be given first a paper signed by Colonel Clark which would serve him as a safe conduct.

I did not oppose this idea for two reasons: 1st, because with this paper I considered him completely free from the charge of being a royalist; and 2d, because it would be slighting to the said Colonel Clark. I gave Mr. Serret a passport to go to Santa Genoveva where he is waiting for the above-mentioned paper. Three days after Mr. de Rochblau's arrest they removed him from prison but kept him under guard, destined to be taken to New England. They put his wife in possession of all her slaves and property.[20] They have also restored their arms to the inhabitants, but those named, Carvoni, Janis, Vital Voucé, and Erno [21] are still kept under arrest and their property confiscated. All these soldiers are enlisted only for six months; they have themselves elected their officers and Congress approved them. They have taken a general census of all the inhabitants and slaves, and are recruiting all the French youths whom they can enlist.

I remain with all respect at your Lordship's service, praying that God may keep you many years.

My dear Sir, the hand of your Lordship is kissed by your most devoted servant,

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez

P. S. Considering what your Lordship ordered me in Art. 5 of your instructions of March 9, of the present year, I am sending you the enclosed letters.

[17] Kao was Cahokia. Captain Joseph Bowman stated that he was sent to Cahokia with a detachment of thirty mounted men (English, I, 559). Serret is Gabriel Cerré, n. 9.

[18] See no. I. [19] Anglo-American.

[20] Concerning the treatment of Madame Marie Michel de Rocheblave, see *Kaskaskia Records*, pp. 62, 155; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 81, 86, 176.

[21] François Carbonneaux [Carvoni] was a notary in Illinois during the British regime, *Kaskaskia Records*, p. 6, n. 3. Nicolas Janis was captain of militia in the British service, *ibid.*, p. 18, n. 4. Erno was perhaps Enau, *dit* Canada, *ibid.*, p. 416, n. 23.

IV CLARK TO O'HARA [22]

Kaskaskias, Illinois, July 15, 1778

My dear Sir:

You already know the situation in which you left me at the Falls and the kind of people with whom I had to deal; but after I had knocked down some and punished and imprisoned others, they became the best people that can be imagined.[23] As soon as this was effected I proceeded to the erection of a fort on the island to store my provisions and on the 24th of June I set sail for this place, having taken ten or twelve prisoners (from whom I learned of your safety).[24] On the 28th I landed near Fort Cheroké and on the following morning I set out with 180 men for Illinois, and after a weary march I crossed the river Kaskaskias on the 4th of July in the night, about a mile above the town. I approached this and attacked the fort, the governor of which we took in his bed. There was great confusion among the inhabitants, who decided that it was the best thing for them to surrender without firing a musket shot.

The following day a party went on to the other towns above. Such was the panic and terror that they conceived when we appeared that it caused them immediately afterwards to give their oath of allegiance to the United States, and I think that they will carry it out like good subjects. Therefore, there is nothing to fear from this district. I shall have to stay here with a hundred men. The savages come frequently and come on terms of peace as far as we are concerned. I have heard many reports about Captain Willing, the greater part of which I think are false.[25] I hope that you visit us on your return.

I am, Sir, with the greatest esteem,

[G. R.] CLARK [26]

My regards to Master Billy.

Captain James Oharra, whom I suppose to be on the Arcas.

[22] Legajo 2370. A Spanish translation of Clark's letter to O'Hara. The original has not been found and may have been retained by O'Hara. Captain James O'Hara was a trader from the vicinity of Fort Pitt. Clark, in his letter to Mason, November 19, 1779, stated that at the Kanawha River he was "joined by Cap^{t} Oharrads Comp^{y} on his way to the Osark". In his *Memoir* Clark also mentioned that he was "joined by Cap^{tn} James O'hara on his way to the Arkansa on publick business". O'Hara explained the nature of his business in a letter to Oliver Pollock, dated June 24, 1778, by saying that he was on his "passage from Fort Pitt with two Bateaus loaded with provisions sent by General Hand for the use of Cap^{n} Willing's party". *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 117, 221.

[23] Falls of the Ohio. Clark, in his letter to Mason, November 19, 1779, wrote: "I had encamped on a small Island in the middle of the Falls. . . . on this Island I first began to discipline my little Army knowing that to be the most essential point towards success." *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 118.

[24] In his letter to Mason, Clark stated: "I got every thing in Readiness on the 26th of June, set off from the Falls, double Man'd our Oars and proceeded day and Night until we run into the mouth of the Tenesse River the fourth day landed on an Island to prepare Ourselves for a March by Land, a few hours after we took a Boat of Hunters but eight days from Kaskaskias." As indicated in the letter to O'Hara, the date of departure was June 24. The date in the letter to Mason is incorrect, *ibid.*

[25] Willing's conduct during his unsuccessful attempt to take West Florida from the

V LEYBA TO CLARK [27]

St. Louis, July 17, 1778

Sir:

I have received your esteemed letter of the 13th current, in which you tell me that you do not know to whom the merchandise which Mr. Polocq forwarded to this side is to be delivered. I too, Sir, am ignorant of its destination. What I am sure of is that the goods are meant for the Bostonaise,[28] but the first time we shall meet we shall speak of this matter and make the most suitable arrangements.

I beg you as a favor to grant the inclosed petition by having the three slaves arrested and turned over to me at this post; the expense and cost entailed by them shall be paid to whomsoever you shall name.

I have the honor of being with my perfect consideration, Sir, your most humble and obedient servant,

LEYBA [rubric]

VI LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis, July 21, 1778

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

Colonel Clark deserves the greatest courtesy from all the inhabitants of his district since they are debtors to him for his pleasant manner, clemency, and upright administration of justice. Although his soldiers are bandits in appearance, he has them under the best of control. I am expecting this gentleman's visit from day to day; I shall show him all the courtesy I can and expect to have the best of dealings with him. I am enclosing for you a letter of his and my reply.

[Closing salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.[29]

British was severely criticized by Spaniards and Americans as well as by the English. For later comments by Clark upon Willing, consult no. IX. Details of Willing's activities are given by John Caughey, "Willing's Expedition down the Mississippi, 1778", *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV, 5 ff.

[26] The Spanish translator of the original letter erroneously transcribed Clark's signature as Roberto Clark.

[27] In French, a copy of the letter sent to Clark, in reply to Clark's letter of July 13, 1778; *cf.* n. 12.

[28] Common Spanish and French designation for the Americans during the early part of the Revolutionary War owing to the fact that the war started in the vicinity of Boston.

[29] The draft of a reply by Gálvez, Sept. 2, 1778, to Leyba's letter of July 11 was attached to the above letter: "In reply to your letter of the 11th last July, I should tell you that I am fully informed of the arrival on the English side of Colonel Jorge Roger Clark with a detachment of Americans of whom you say that they seized the buildings and the commandant, Mr. Rocheblave, on the 5th of that month leaving his wife in free possession of all her property, and that the following day the citizens of Oka and Kao took the oath of allegiance, and the rest that you report to me about Mr. Serret. By the other of the 21st of July, I see the satisfaction which the inhabitants of those above-mentioned settlements enjoy from Colonel Clark's pleasant manner, clemency, and upright administration of justice. I received the two letters which he wrote to you and I approve of the three you sent to him, the copies of which you sent me."

VII LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis, August 6, 1778

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

I have received your letter of April 3d and also the three enclosed dispatches. The latter have been delivered to Colonel Clark, by which I believe that I have fulfilled the commission. The said Colonel Clark promised me to send them to their destinations as soon as possible and to give me the replies, which I shall send to your Lordship at once.

I have no news of the boats which your Lordship mentions to me in that letter, but I have heard that along with my bateau another left that place laden on the account of Mr. Poloc with goods for the Bostonese. It reached this post along with mine and at the end of a few days another arrived on the account of a citizen of this town, Mr. Besollell,[30] loaded by the said Poloc and with the same destination. All the goods are stored at the same Besolell's house, where they will remain until Colonel Clark asks me for them, since I had already given him notification of them before receiving it from your Lordship.

[Closing salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.

VIII CLARK TO LEYBA

Kaskaskias October 26th. 1778

Dr. Sir:

Since I had the pleasure of seeing of you last I have been lingering under a Letidious Spell of Sickness, but at last have recovered my former Agility. I have the pleasure to inform you that the Express that Carried the Letters that you delivered to me with my own Arrive safe at St. Asapp a post near the borders of the frontiers of Virginia, nearly past all danger and I make no doubt of his being at or near the Congress by this time, as I had given him every nessisary Instruction and Warrents to forward him, with strict orders to return amediately under the penalty of Incuring my displeasure and Suffering as the Law directs for negglect of his duty.

I dont doubt but you have had some account of the flight of the British Army from Philadelphia to New York last summer.[31] Genl. Washington laying before the City with a numerous Army prepairing to storm the Town, having Repaired the Fortifications on the Delaware formerly distroyed by the English so that no ship could get to their Relief. Sensible of the Inevitable Ruin except they could make their escapes through the Jerseys to

[30] Eugene Pouré, frequently called "Beausoleil", was one of the first settlers of St. Louis. His chief occupation was that of merchant engaged in the Indian trade of Spanish Illinois. On August 6, 1778, Clark wrote to Oliver Pollock as follows: "M^r Beausoleil was with me the other day and informed me he was employ'd by you to bring up a large Assortment of Goods to Pancore [St. Louis], and believes they are for the States." Pouré in 1781, acting in the capacity of captain of militia, led the successful Spanish expedition against the British Fort St. Joseph. Louis Houck, *A History of Missouri* (Chicago, 1909), II, 42–46; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 64; Lawrence Kinnaird, "The Spanish Expedition against Fort St. Joseph in 1781", *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, XIX, 174, 180–183, 186, 188.

[31] Clinton's rear guard left Philadelphia on June 18, 1778. The battle of Monmouth was fought ten days later.

York whare their Shiping lay they Attempted it Crosing the Delawar in the Night and got thirty Mi. distance before they ware overtaking by an Army Caled the Flying Camp that was posted in the Jerseys Commanded by General Lee the first attact that he made on the English Army. their was Two thousand five Hundred and fifty five found dead on the Field besides wounded. the Letters that I Received dont mention what became of the british Army afterwards only that the pursuite was Continued with great Suckcess, the Post Siting out for Fort Du Quesne before their fate was known. if any part of them Got to New York I am apprehensive the Americans would Incourage them to stay untill the Winter Rather than Drive them on Board their Ships for fear they might Reinforce the Garison at Quebeck and occasion the loss of some Blood this winter that might otherways be saved

The English Commissioners that was Sent to treat with the Americans have returned from Congress with their propotials Disdainfully Rejected. what will be the Consequence I dont know perhaps Another Army Sent over to have their throts Cut if they have not too Much Imployment in Europe. I have had Indian Reports twice from the Army Marching to Detroit and every Day expect an Express from thence as it is Certainly taken long ago. I expect their will be but Little Mercy Shewn to the Indians or Indian Partizans that have been at war against us as no punishment Can be too great for the Crimes they have been guilty of. the Detachment I sent up the Waubash River penetrated as high as the Weaugh, Mr. Celeron their Main Object making his escape. after holding a treaty with the Indians taking oaths of Fidelity from the Inhabitants Making some Regulations etc. they Returned to St Vincent [32]

Their is no obstruction to the Rapidity of our Arms this Fall and Winter every person that is acquainted with the Situation of affairs in America at present, will take it for granted that by the ensuing Spring Britain may Say—with truth that she has not a single Foot of Ground in possession on this Continent except Hudsons Bay or som such place I dayley expect a messenger from His Excellency the Governor Gen. of Virginia and shall do my self the Honour to transmit to you what Inteligence I think worthy your attention if any transpire

I remain Sir with the Greates Respect your Very Humble Servant

G. R. Clark

P. S. My Compliments to Madm. Lebau and my two favourites the little Misses

IX Clark to Leyba

Kaskaskias Nov. 6th. 1778

Dr. Sir:

I a few Days ago wrote to you signifying all the news that I had then received. Captn. J. Harrod on Comd. from the Falls of Ohio arrived hear two Days ago, Confirming the Inteligence that we had already heard

And that the Absolute orders of Congress to the Army now in the Indian Country is to Shew no mercy to those that have been at war against the

[32] Vincennes. Elsewhere Clark wrote that Celeron, "One of the British Agents residing at Oucaugh [Ouiatanon] about eighty Leagues above S[t] Vincents, hurt our Interest much". Captain Helm with a force of about a hundred men was sent to Ouiatanon for the purpose of capturing Celeron. *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 130.

States. I find that Genl. McIntosh has Suckceeded Genl. Hand in the Command of this army [33]

Sir Respecting three Slaves that you wrote to me about I told you personally the reason I had for not amediately apprehending them was to get all three. as soon as they came together, I wrote the same Hour to Mr. Cartabone, to send a party of Men to Receive them they not having the least suppition of what was intended against them. I did not Confine them. Mr. Cartabones Men being Sick (Mr. Perault going to St. Louis with a Barge of yours) he desired that I would send the slaves by him which I resolved to do but Mr. Cartabone being at a loss to get my Letter Translated was obliged to have recource to Several persons. the report amediately spread and in less than Tenn Hours the Slave was apprised of it, and made their excapes. for before I thought a person Could have returned from St. Geneveeve, for fear some Actident of the sort might happen, I sent a file of Men to secure them and they ware gone. Several persons having com from the Spanish Side, Since my Letr. had been Read their. Every precaution that I took to find out the person that warned them of Letter I had sent to Mr. Cartabone proved infectuall. I am Sorry to say that I blame a person whose Charactor ought not to be Impeached without apparent facts, or his own Violation of it Should be obvious to the Eyes of world. in short Sir, I can Hardly Excuse my own Conduct. I offered Sixty Dollars Reward for them but to no purpose it is supposed they are gone to St. Joseph to their old Master

The Inteligence from Orleans is bad. I dont doubt you have before this been made Acquainted with it. I am now Convinced of what I have long suspected the bad Conduct of an American Officer in that Quarter.[34] when plunder is the prevailing Passion of any Body of Troops wheather Great or Small, their Cuntrey Can Expect but little service from them. Which I am sorry to find was too Much the Case with the party I allude to. Floriday on the Mississippi Might have been good subjects to the States if proper Measures had been taken and probably Saved the Expence of a Campain. I should be happy hereaftor to find that I am Mistaken on this head

I have the Honour Sir to be with the greates Respect your very Humble Servant.

G. R. Clark.

Monsieur Lebay

X Leyba to Gálvez

San Luis, November 16, 1778

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

The good harmony which Colonel Clark and I keep makes me think that our reactions are in harmony; that is, he has from his superiors with regard to us similar instructions to those which your Lordship was pleased to give me with regard to them. For if it were not so, I believe that some small differences which have occurred and which we have ended in friendly fashion would have irritated us. As it is they have served only to strengthen our friendship the more.

[33] General Lachlan McIntosh was directed in May, 1778, to relieve General Edward Hand at Fort Pitt. *Frontier Defense on the Upper Ohio, 1777–1778*, Reuben Gold Thwaites and Louise Phelps Kellogg, eds. (Madison, 1912), pp. 297–298.

[34] Captain James Willing, see n. 25.

One of these was that one day two of his officers came to this post with orders from their colonel to arrest and take to their side the American deserters that they found on mine. These officers came with orders from their chief not to do so without my permission, and apparently they and he thought that laying the matter before me and my granting it would be one and the same thing. Of course I answered them that I could not consent to it because it was against the rights and privileges which my sovereign's domains enjoyed. They replied that they did not know the matter was so delicate and that no offense was intended, and Colonel Clark gave me the same answer in person. Another was that this same gentleman offered a lieutenancy to the son of a merchant of this post, Mr. Perro,[35] provided he recruited twelve men. For this purpose the above-mentioned Perro came to me with a recommendation from his colonel that I permit him to hold an enlistment on my side. I refused, showing them Subject VIII, Title X, article 114 of the royal ordinances, at which both instigator and agent said that they were satisfied.

These passages have taken place with such frank courtesy that neither the said Clark has complained of my refusals nor I of his suggestions. He let me see a copy of the letter which he wrote to Congress, in which he expresses himself as proud and pleased at the fine reception he had been given by the Spanish commandant of this district. It is true that there was a great consuming of powder at his arrival as well as at his departure. I entertained him at meals and laid thirty covers on his first visit which lasted two days. Dances were given for him both nights and a supper to the ladies and dancers, and lodging in my house with as much formality as was possible for me.

[Closing salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.[36]

XI HENRY TO LEYBA[37]

Williamsburgh in Virginia Dec. 12th. 1778

Sir:

Colonel Clark who commands the Forces of this Commonwealth at the Illinois, will have the Honor to deliver this letter to you and at the same time to bear my high Regards to you. I beg leave to recommend that Gentleman, to your friendly Notice and Regards which I also have to request towards all the Subjects of this State. At the same time, I tender to you Sir

[35] Perrault.

[36] On the margin Gálvez noted the draft of his reply (Jan. 13, 1779), of which the pertinent paragraph states: "By your letter of November 16th of the year just past, I see the intelligence you have shown and the harmony you have kept with the commandant on the other side of the river from those settlements. This gives me great pleasure and I hope that you will continue co-operating with them on your part in accordance with the instructions I sent you."

[37] This was followed, Dec. 15, by a similar letter of Governor Henry to Leyba, to be delivered by John Todd, "Commandant and County Lieutenant for this state at Illinois". The Virginia legislature on December 9, 1778, passed a bill establishing the county of Illinois. John Todd, a friend of Clark, was appointed by Governor Henry to take charge of civil affairs. For the letter informing Clark of Todd's appointment, consult *Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia*, H. R. McIlwaine, ed. (Richmond, 1926), I, 345; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 87.

and to all the Subjects of his Catholic Majesty, every Assistance, and friendly Interchange of good offices, which the mutual Happiness and prosperity of both People shall make necessary.

I shall be happy to embrace every opportunity of shewing my high Regards to his Catholic Majesty's Interests, and that I am with great Truth Sir

Your most obedient Servant

P. Henry

The Honorable
The Spanish Commandant near the Ilinois
Favored by Col. Clark.

XII Hamilton to Gálvez[38]

St. Vincennes, January 13th. 1779

Sir:

M^r^. Le Comte having desired permission to pass to New Orleans I embrace the opportunity of kissing your Excellency's hands, and at the same time of acquainting you with the circumstance which procures me that Honor.

The Rebel Americans having got footing in the Ilinois Country, and of course having opend a communication to the Colonies by taking Post there and at this place, I thought it my duty to dispossess them as soon as convenient.

For this purpose I set out with a small force from the Detroit, so late as the seventh of last October, and arrived here on the 17^th^. of December, having a few Chiefs and Warriors of thirteen different Nations of Indians along with me.

Having taken Possession of the Fort, and receiv'd the Submission of the Inhabitants who laid down their arms and swore Allegiance to His Britannic Majesty, I contented myself, for this Winter, with sending out parties to different Quarters.

Your Excellency cannot be unacquainted with what was commonly practiced in the time of your Predecessor in the Government of New Orleans, I mean the sending of supplies of Gunpowder and other stores to the Rebels, then in arms against their Sovereign—Tho' this may have been transacted in an underhand manner by merchants, unknown to the Governor, I must suppose that under your Excellency's orders, such commerce will for the future be positively prohibited—

The several Nations of Savages who accompanied me to this Country may (if this traffic be continued) forget what instructions I have given them from time to time with relation to the subjects of His Catholic Majesty, but the native Inhabitants of the Banks of the Ohio River, must be particularly jealous of strangers coming up thro their Country to supply the Rebels with

[38] Legajo 2370. A copy of this letter is in the Haldimand Collection. Henry Hamilton was the English lieutenant governor and superintendent of Indian affairs who had been stationed at Detroit. At about the same time that he wrote to the governor of Louisiana, Hamilton prepared another letter upon which he made the following comment: "A letter was also sent for Capt. Blomer [Blommart] at the Natchez by a person who I expected would betray his trust & show it to Don Bernardo de Galvez at New Orleans." *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1887, p. 217; Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, *Collections*, IX, 497.

whom they are at War. At the same time that I mention this to your Excellency, for the sake of individuals who might suffer from their ignorance of the English being in possession of this Post, and of the communication by Water to the Mississipi, I think it incumbent on me to represent further to your Excellency that the Rebels at Kaskasquias being in dayly apprehension of the arrival of a body of Men from the upper Posts accompanyed with the Savages from that Quarter, have declared that they will take Refuge on the Spanish Territory as soon as they are apprized of their coming—

As it is my intention early in the Spring to take a Progress towards the Ilinois, I shall represent to the Officers commanding at several small Forts and Posts for His Catholic Majesty, the impropriety of affording an Asylum to Rebels, in arms against their lawful Sovereign—If after so candid a declaration the Rebels should find shelter in any Fort or Post on the Mississipi, it will become my Duty to dislodge them, in which case their protectors must blame their own Conduct, if they should suffer any inconvenience in consequence.

Perhaps I may be favor'd with a letter from your Excellency before the arrival of the reinforcements I expect the next Spring, at the same time that the Officers acting under your Excellency's orders may receive notice how they are to act, whether as Friends or Enemies to the British Empire—

I have the honor to be Sir

Your Excellency's most devoted and most obedient humble Servant

HENRY HAMILTON
Lieutenant Governor of Detroit

His Excellency the Governor of New Orleans—

XIII CLARK TO LEYBA

Kaskaskias January 23rd. 1779

Dear Sir:

A few Days ago a body of Enemies appeared near this Place as I expected to attack it but on the appearance of Captain Bowmans arrival they have Retreated I did every thing that lay in my power to find their Incampment in order to attack them as I was Convinced that they was not able to attack the Fort otherways they Certainly would have done [so] as soon as they came into the Neighberhood but my attempts was fruitless. Post Vincent is Certainly in the possession of the Royalists Mr. Vego I expect is detained [39] all the Inteligence that I have had is from the Enimy through a party of our Hunters that spoke to them in the Plains they say that Mr. Hammilton of Detroit is at the Opost [40] with a small army of French English and Indians

[39] Francisco Vigo, a merchant of Spanish Illinois and business partner of Lieutenant Governor Leyba, was captured by one of Hamilton's scouting parties while on his way to Vincennes with supplies for Captain Helm. Later released because he was a Spanish subject, he returned directly to St. Louis in compliance with a promise made to Hamilton, but then hastened to Kaskaskia and gave Clark valuable information concerning the situation at Vincennes. Vigo's assistance to the Americans is well known, but Leyba's influence with him may have been an important factor in his conduct. These two men were responsible for most of the credit obtained by Clark in the Spanish district. Winsor, p. 133; Thompson, "Penalties of Patriotism", *loc. cit.*, pp. 404–411; Randall, "Clark's Service of Supply", *loc. cit.*, p. 258; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 138; no. XXV.

[40] Vincennes or Poste du Ouabache.

I wish he may be their as I then shall be sensible that he has been Drove from Detroit Since the Lakes Freesed but their is no dependance to be put in what they say. I expect a true Information Every Hour as I have Several small parties gone to OPost for scalps and prisoners. it is whispered that the Enemy is determined to take this Garison and only wait for favourable weather for their March. they are welcome to it if they win it for I am determined that they shall pay dear for it, but its a mear Farce to think that they Could Raise a force Suffitient to attack this place, Except they Evacuated Detroit. I am sorry to find that their is many Trators in the Country one I have Burnt in the Hand for his Conduct and am determined to Hang the next that I can Get a suffitient Proof against As soon as my Spies Returns from the Post you Shall Amediately have the News

I am Sir with the Greatest Esteem your Very Humble Servant

G. R. CLARK

N B My Compliments to Madam Layba and your Ladies

Don Fernando DeLeba Esq
Lieut. Governor Western Illinois, St. Louis.

XIV LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ [41]

San Luis de Ylinueses, February 5, 1779

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

By the enclosed letter from Colonel Clark and the information which the bearer, Francisco Vigo, can give your Lordship (from having been Governor Almilthon's [42] prisoner) you will learn the events which have occurred in this region between the royalists and the Americans. For my own part, I tell your Lordship that this Almilthon is a depraved man who has countless Indians at his service and great ill will toward the Spaniards because, he says, they protect the rebels. He has been informed with great accuracy of the number of houses there are in this town, the garrison, and whether there is any fortification.

The affair has me somewhat on the alert. Sixteen men including the drummer are all the troops I have with me and I hardly have forty of the militiamen capable of bearing arms since at this season they are all trading on the Misury, hunting, or in that place.[43] Although the barracks are of stone they would be little protection since their parts are not protected by one another. Neither can one from within prevent the enemy from approaching its walls and they could make the breach they need to enter without the slightest risk. If the attack which he directs at Colonel Clark were only by royalist troops, there would not be the least fear, but the practice in Indian wars is to attack not where one should but where there is the least risk; and for that

[41] The draft of a reply by Gálvez (Mar. 23), written in the margin of the first page, reads as follows: "From Colonel Clark's letter which you sent me in yours of February 5th last and the report which I received from Francisco Vigo, I learned of Mr. Hamilton's intentions. In view of this and what you tell me, I should say that I deeply regret not being able to aid you and that I hope your zeal and energy will not spare measures to avoid all conflict by remaining neutral to both parties so as to keep peace and harmony with them; and in case the aforesaid Hamilton attempts to attack you, you will be able to act in such a manner as to preserve the honor of our arms."

[42] Hamilton.

[43] New Orleans.

purpose this side is more desirable than the American because, in addition to the fact that they are 190 in number, they are in a good log fort with seven cannon.

Nevertheless, if these towns under my command should be attacked through the influence of Sr. Almilthon, I shall do my best to leave the honor of Spanish arms untarnished. For this reason I am acting with the greatest vigilance, and I have given the few inhabitants who are present the orders which seemed necessary to me so that they should not be caught unprepared. I call the whole to your Lordship's attention so that you may be pleased to make the arrangements which you think desirable for the safety of this district (incapable of receiving aid in its straits) and for the honor of the one who commands it.

[Closing salutations]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez. FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

XV CLARK TO LEYBA

Post St. Vincenes Ft. P Henry March 1st. 79

Dr. Sir:

After a Fatieguing Journy of Nineteen days under going Every Difficulty that Could possiby have happened by High Waters and the want of provisions, I arrived at this Town on the 23d of Feby. at 7 O Clock in the Evening and Attack the Fort Amediately I never saw a Much pritier fire than Keep up on Both Sides for Eighteen Hours.[44] Governor Hamilton being ordered to Surrender he thought proper to Comply. I was Much Supprised after Seeing his Men Stores Strength of Fort etc that he should think of Surrendering to a body of Men not Double his number [45] as I hope Shortly to have the pleasure of Giving you a Verbal Account of the whole I shall Omit it in my Let'r.

Many Little Circumstances would divert you. the Express that I expected has arrived at this place all well a Circumstance hapned that gave me Great uneasiness which was this in a packet of Letters from the Governor General their was one Directed to you among Many others of Mine and in breaking them Open one after another I unfortunately broak yours before I Knew whose it was and Read but two words befor I discovered my Mistake I hope Sir that you will pardon me for the Neglect as you may Rest assured that I will not Read it. I would Send it to you but I have orders to Deliver it with my own hands and at the same time I shall Acquaint you of Every peace of Inteligence their is a Regiment of Troops now on their March to Illinois your Letters have been Received by the persons they ware Directed to. I have ordered Mr. Murry to give you a Detail of Our Expedition and attack on the Fort I hope it will meet with your aprobation.

I am Sir with the Greatest Respect your

G. R. CLARK.

P S My Compliments to Madam Leyba and the young Ladies

Don Fernando de Leyba Esq.
Lieu't Governor, St Louis
fr Mr. Murry

[44] John Rogers described the action at Vincennes in almost the same words as those used by Clark. "We . . . arrived and attacked the Fort the 23^rd at Seven o clock in the Eavening there being a very brisk fire on both sides for 18 hours". *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. 344.

[45] For lists of prisoners taken at Vincennes, see *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 110–112.

XVI CLARK TO LEYBA

Cohas April 21st. 1779

Dear Sir:

On my arrival in this Town I received an Express from the Falls of Ohio Containing very disagreeable news of My Express being Kiled near that post and the Packet to his Excellency Distroyed.[46] this unlucky Circumstance obliges me to set out amediately for Kaskaskias in order to send of another Express as Quick as possible I hope you will prepair your Letter (if Convenient) amediately. the letter that I received Contained no other news of Consequence except the safe arrival of Governor Hamilton at Kentucky and of that Country being Strongly Reinforced [47]

I Shall embrace every opertunity of Writing to you and let you know what Inteligence I may have in mean time am with the Greatest Sincerity your Friend and very Humble Servant

G. R. CLARK

Don Fernando de Leyba Esq.
Lieutenant Governor, St. Louis and its Dependances
St. Louis.

XVII LEYBA TO HENRY [48]

San Luis de Ylinueses, April 23, 1779

Your Excellency:

Colonel Jorge Clark has delivered to me your Excellency's esteemed letter of the 12th of December just past. Its contents gave me the greatest pleasure; first, because it is very much in accord with the instructions which I have from my General; and second, because your Excellency has deigned to honor me with your letter.

From the time that my friend Colonel Clark arrived in this place, fraternal harmony has reigned between the people from the United States and the vassals of his Catholic Majesty.

The said Colonel Clark's wisdom and affability have made him generally loved by all who know him, and I give your Excellency a thousand thanks for having given me a neighbor who by his friendly manners has made me his debtor for the greatest courtesies, your Excellency's esteemed recommendation being under the circumstances not the one of least consideration. I beg that your Excellency will not regard me as negligent, if there is anything in which I can be of service, since I offer your Excellency my most sincere regards, and pray that God may keep you many years.

Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

FERN^DO DE LEYBA

To his Excellency, Señor Don Patrick Henry.

[46] William Myers, the courier bearing important documents from Clark to Governor Henry, was killed and scalped by a party of Indians on the Kentucky side of the Ohio. Some of the letters were thrown away and later recovered by the Americans. Others, among which were Clark's journal describing the capture of Vincennes and the letter of Leyba to Henry, were turned over by the Indians to British officers. *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 305–306, 309, 618; Consul Wilshire Butterfield, *History of George Rogers Clark's Conquest of the Illinois and the Wabash Towns, 1778 and 1779* (Columbus, 1904), pp. 771–772; "Intercepted Letters and Journal of George Rogers Clark, 1778, 1779", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, I, 90–96.

[47] James Patten to Clark, Apr. 10, 1779, *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 309–310.

[48] A copy of the letter sent to Henry in reply to his letter of the previous December [no. XI].

XVIII LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis de Ylinueses, April 24, 1779

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

On the 20th of the present month the boats of Sergeant Albarez and Mr. Chouteau arrived. At the first safe opportunity I shall answer your Lordship's letters which I received by the hand of Mr. Chouteau.

No news worthy of your Lordship's attention has occurred at this post except that Colonel Clark (who has been promoted to the position of Governor General of the district of Ylinueses) has rid us of the gentleman Almilton by deciding to go to attack him at the post of Vencen where he was entrenched. The firing lasted eighteen hours and he surrendered thinking himself attacked by some thousand Americans, but he was deceived since there were only a hundred and twenty and he had eighty-five soldiers within the fort and a great number of Indians in parties outside.[49] He has been sent to Virginia with his officers. Nevertheless, some of the said Almilton's parties of Indians are staying in the neighborhood of these towns, apparently with good intentions.

I am enclosing for your Lordship a letter which I received from the General of Virginia, my reply on the back, and two from Colonel Clark.

[Closing salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.

XIX CLARK TO LEYBA

Kaskaskias, 26th. May 79

Dr. Sr.:

I this moment had Inteligence of your being at St Geneveeve this four Days past If so I am much surpprised that I should not hear of it before this I can hardly Credit the Report although I expect you Every Day, but in order to be satisfied I have sent over a Serjeant to know the Truth. nothing would give me more pleasure than to See you and shall be uneasy untill I get an answer which I shall Impatintly Expect by Midday

I am your Real Friend and Humble Servant

G. R. CLARK

Don Fernando De Leyba Esq.

XX CLARK TO LEYBA

De Kaskaskias, May 29th, 1779

Dr. Sir:

I this moment Received your Letter by Mr. Gebault[50] and am happy of

[49] Joseph Bowman stated that, when Clark's expedition left Kaskaskia on February 5, 1779, the number of men in it was "170 Including the Artillery Pack Horsemen &c.". Clark gave the same number in his *Memoir*. Elsewhere Bowman said that the part of Clark's forces which marched overland to Vincennes consisted of 130 men. John Rogers made the following statement concerning the combatants at Vincennes: "We made 101 prisoners and had only 130 men 60 of which were French." *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 156, 269, 316, 334.

[50] Father Pierre Gibault was the only priest in British Illinois at the time of Clark's arrival. He was in sympathy with the American cause and rendered Clark many valuable services, notably the winning over of the French population at Vincennes. Later he made his headquarters at Ste. Genevieve and crossed to Kaskaskia when needed.

hearing of your Health I am Rejoiced to find the period so short as next Wednsday when we shall have the pleasure of Meeting

The Friendship and Union that I am sure Subsists between us Emboldens me to make the following Request The Bearer of this Letter Mr. Linsey [51] is a Gentleman of Charactor and is Imployed by Government to Speculate on the Mississippi and to furnish our Friendly Indians with goods (he being used to that trade) his destination at present is to New Orleans but for his Security on the passage I Send him to wait on you for your protection and passport for that purpos the granting of which will be a favor acknowledged by your Real Friend and Very Humble Servant

G. R. Clark

[Torn] presents their Compliments [torn] and Mr. Cartabona and [torn] with the thought of Injoy [torn] wednesday Six OClock [torn] the Eavening

[Addressed:]
To Mr. Fernando de Leyba Esq.

XXI Clark to Leyba [52]

Kaskaskia, May 29, 1779.

My Dear Sir:

I had been looking forward to the pleasure of seeing you tomorrow, but Colonel Montgomery's arrival has rendered me quite unable to enjoy this good fortune, because my whole attention is required to place the new troops in a state of discipline before I may leave them.

Nothing but my duty to my country would rob me of the pleasure of visiting you, but that is too sacred a thing for me to neglect, so that I do not doubt that you will excuse me.

If I can find time, I shall cross over. All the gentlemen of this place are eager for your arrival here, as they respect you and, being sure that you are a soldier, we hope that you will excuse our campaign fare.

I am sure that you will be glad to know that his troops are arriving. I am expecting three hundred men in about twenty days. Although they are young and undisciplined, I hope that in a little while I shall render them easy to handle through the system which all soldiers must observe.

I am, with all possible respect, Sir and Friend,

Your most humble and obedient Servant,

G. R. Clark

My most humble Respects and those of the gentlemen to Mr. de Cartabona.

XXII Leyba to Gálvez

San Luis, June 9, 1779

Señor Governor General

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

At the request of my neighbor Colonel Clark I have placed in your Lord-

Kaskaskia Records, pp. xxv-xxxii; Thompson, "Penalties of Patriotism", *loc. cit.*, pp. 413–421.

[51] Joseph Lindsay was the bearer of Clark's letter of June 12, 1779, to Pollock at New Orleans. William Beckley wrote concerning Lindsay's mission: "I recollect . . . that while the troops lay on the Mississippi Mr. Lindsay came to us on his way to New Orleans on business of the State of Virginia & took with him two men to row. Soon after two boat loads of Goods came up from Orleans, brought, as I understood, by Lindsay for the supply of the troops." *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 330–331; *Kaskaskia Records*, p. 348.

[52] The MS. is in French.

ship's envelope the dispatches relating to the commission given by the General of Virginia to Mr. Lindezay, the bearer of this. At the same time the aforesaid colonel asked me to recommend him to your Lordship, as I now do with great pleasure because he seems to me a worthy man.

On the 28th of last month two hundred Americans came to Cascazia and three hundred more should come within a few days.

Colonel Clark is leaving the last of the present month with a strong detachment, and with that and another which is to join him on the way he is going to attack the place called the Detruet located between the Lakes Lurien and Sancler.[53]

[Closing salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.

XXIII LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis de Ylinueses, July 13, 1779.

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

[The body of the letter concerns minor matters at St. Louis]

P. S. I enclose to you three letters from Colonel Clark, and one from the General of Virginia. The said Clark marched on the 29th of last month to attack Detruet.[54] The lack of these people begins to make itself felt in the district, for since they went away, many alarms have occurred in all the towns on the other side as well as this. They are occasioned by the Indian nations [formerly] directed by Mr. Almilton, and many others who have joined them, and who remain in these parts. In Cascascia they have killed two inhabitants and wounded two more. In the salt-works of Santa Genoveva they killed two more; and four from this town who went up in a pirogue were also killed before they reached Santa Genoveva. If the Americans do not come out victorious in the said expedition against Detruet, we shall be still worse off.

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.

XXIV LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis de Ylinueses, October 18, 1779.

Señor Governor General,

My Dear and Most Respected Sir:

Mr. Borgas just delivered to the Americans 22,000 livres of deerskins in payment for which the civil governor, Don Juan Tot,[55] has given him two bills of exchange, one for 30,000 pesos and the other for 10,000. I inform your Lordship of this because of the report which they may cause in that place [56] to the effect that they are the payment for some shipment worth from twenty-five to thirty thousand pesos which only bears a regular profit. But there is no truth in this, for what he bought in his shipment was not worth more than

[53] Leyba evidently means Lakes Huron and St. Clair, although Detroit is between Lakes St. Clair and Erie.

[54] Clark arrived at Vincennes on July 1, 1779, to prepare for an advance against Detroit. He had expected to receive reinforcements of about 300 men from Kentucky. Only about thirty volunteers arrived. There were inadequate supplies even for the men he had. Clark was forced to abandon the project. *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, pp. 150–151.

[55] John Todd. [56] New Orleans.

3000 pesos, and Mr. Borgas sold it to those Americans at a time when no one wished to accept their papers for anything.[57]

It was not so when they arrived, and the skins were sold to them at very moderate prices in good faith that their papers would be honored immediately in that place. Since this matter might discredit the bills of exchange issued at that time, it has seemed proper to me to bring it to the attention of your Lordship in order to avoid this damage.

[Closing Salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez

XXV LEYBA TO GÁLVEZ

San Luis de Ylinueses, October 18, 1779

My Dear Sir and Protector:

The letters I sent your Lordship from the General of Virginia and Governor Clark will serve, I believe, as authentic documents to prove clearly to your Lordship my scrupulousness in the handling of this affair. I assure your Lordship with all respect that by courtesy alone I should not have been able to accomplish so much. It was my good works which forced them to live in harmony with the Spanish government of this side, but, my Governor, how dearly this little bit of idle splendor has cost me. My family weeps and I share with them in their just regret.

My undermined health does not promise me many years of life and, when this is ended, my poor daughters have no other resources to save them from beggary than the property that my hardships may have secured for them.[58] By your Lordship's favor and protection I had well-founded hopes of freeing them from so bitter a potion, but the coming of the Americans to this district has ruined me utterly. Several inhabitants of this town, who put their property in the hands of these Americans to please me, find themselves in the same situation, and these losses are equally a matter of regret to me with my own

[57] Since Oliver Pollock at New Orleans until July, 1779, continued to receive Continental money and pay "Boatmen and Traders silver dollars for Paper Currency Dollar for Dollar", this paper depreciated more slowly in the Mississippi Valley than in the East. American traders becoming aware of the situation came to the Illinois country with large quantities of depreciated currency for the purpose of buying furs from the traders and trappers there. The inhabitants soon began to lose faith in the Continental and Virginia paper money and, as a result, it also became more and more difficult for the American officers in Illinois to purchase supplies for the troops. On October 3, 1779, Todd wrote to Clark as follows: "I lately made a purchase (tho' upon Terms which do not please me) of 21,000 lb Peltry with which I shall always have it in my power to purchase provision here." The practice of purchasing peltries was explained by William Shannon as follows: "The paper money being of no account these peltries were bought up, to establish a fund to Purchase provisions for the Troops, that were to be left to garrison the Illinois. For an expedition was then proposed by Col. Clark against Detroit." *Kaskaskia Records*, pp. 128, 130; *Clark Papers, 1771–1781*, p. xcviii; Randall, "George Rogers Clark's Service of Supply", *loc. cit.*, pp. 259–261.

[58] Leyba died on the 28th of the following June and was buried in the church at St. Louis beside his wife, whose death he relates in the letter above. Houck, *A History of Missouri*, vol. II, p. 32, n. 71, p. 41; Frederic L. Billon, *Annals of St. Louis in its Early Days under the French and Spanish Dominations* (St. Louis, 1886), p. 205.

since I consider myself the immediate cause of them. But what was there for me to do with your Lordship's orders except to come to their aid in view of the fact that even the principal leader, however many American documents he brought, had not a shirt to cover his nakedness. I accomplished this on my credit with all the inhabitants so that they might provide these Americans with whatever they needed.

This measure relieved them from their affliction and I was left as hostage, since I became bondsman for ten thousand pesos (as is clear from the receipts that I have in various places in this post, which must be paid). On their part I was paid by two bills of exchange which Francisco Vigo took to that place,[59] and they have not been paid. I do not think that those that go down there from my district could be many more since these inhabitants think that they are sufficiently afflicted and ruined; but I do think that there will be other new appeals begging me to pay the sums which I guaranteed. I acted in this way, my Governor, thinking to do a service for your Lordship and please you. The result of this is that I am now overwhelmed with trouble not only for what I owe and cannot pay, but also by the chance that your Lordship may not approve my measures (this is what tortures me most) although all were intended to show you my blind obedience.

These inhabitants did not want to give up their goods even for Colonel Clark's receipts. They gave them immediately when I pledged mine. If I lose my credit by not being able to pay them, the service may be retarded as a consequence since it is certain that, if I need some unexpected aid for my troops, I shall not get it.

Finally, my Governor, my beloved wife, who came to this exile with so many hardships only to bring it about that at the end of it we should return to Spain, when she saw her hopes frustrated by the labyrinth of debts in which she found me involved, was overcome by such a great melancholy that after only five days of illness in bed, she passed from this to another life, without my repeated urgings that we could trust to your Lordship's favor being able to relieve her. [I assured her that] your Lordship, intervening, would not fail to look upon our cause with pity, but nothing was sufficient because the unexpected blow had been too much of a shock. Her loss makes me look upon that of my property as an affair of little importance. Therefore, in company with my weeping little daughters, I implore your Lordship's protection for the collection of these bills of exchange. I do not doubt that your chivalrous heart will grant it to me, at least out of pity for these innocent little girls, even though it be necessary to appeal to the court, inasmuch as whatever I have done has been purely an act of hospitality, fitting between any nations.

[Customary salutations]

FERN^DO DE LEYBA [rubric]

Señor Don Bernardo de Galvez.

[59] New Orleans.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF GENERAL, ANCIENT, AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Editor-in-chief, EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN; Associate Editor, ALVIN JOHNSON. Volumes XIV, XV, *Servitudes-Zwingli.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934; 1935. Pp. xxiii, 676; xxii, 714. $7.50 each.)

THE summer of 1935 saw the completion of one of the most interesting of twentieth century intellectual adventures. The social scientists and the purveyors of various brands of social philosophy throughout the Western World were called upon to set forth their ideas briefly in a series whose sponsors were as much interested in the interrelations of social disciplines as in the content of particular ones. Very properly in the first introduction in Volume I the editors ask, "What are the Social Sciences?" Of those listed in their answer three, "politics", "economics", and "history" are affirmed to have emerged in classical Greece while a fourth, "jurisprudence", was a product of Roman thought. Of modern vintage are three others, "anthropology", "penology", and "sociology", listed in the order of their appearance. Besides these seven "purely social sciences" the *Encyclopaedia* presents as "semi-social sciences" "ethics", "education", "philosophy", and "psychology". Other disciplines mentioned as touching in some of their aspects upon the social field are "biology", "medicine", and "linguistics". The editors conclude their schematization with the warning that "No one who wishes to understand the operation of social laws in the modern world can afford to overlook the evidence offered by the arts". There is no place in the scheme for religion which appears to be clearly beyond the pale. It is with some surprise, therefore, that the reader finds in later volumes in the articles on "Christianity", "Taoism", "Islam", religion brought into the series without explanation or comment like the illegitimate offspring at a family reunion.

Having set forth what are the social sciences, the editors make no attempt to answer the other question, What is a Social Science? This task is delegated to Benjamin Ginzburg who in the essay on "Science" advances the following definition. "These sciences [natural and social], or this science, may be said to look for knowledge in terms of which man may envisage the future course of phenomena unrolling themselves or capable of unrolling themselves before his perception and on the basis of which he may alter future arrangements of phenomena to suit his practical interests. Science may be defined as a far flung system of knowledge couched in terms which

allow it to serve as a theoretical basis for practical technique" (XIII, 591, b). In a sense the *Encyclopaedia* is designed to discover how near the social disciplines have approached to the scientific ideal. At the end of the nineteenth century the hope was widespread in intellectual circles that the social sciences, using the "scientific method", would prove to be tools with which to fabricate a fair new world. There is skepticism in the *Encyclopaedia* and in some places even a suggestion of fear. E. R. A. Seligman confirms a growing suspicion with the comment that economics "has long been and will perhaps ever continue to be the battle ground for rationalizations for group and class interests" (V, 344, a). "It is in the nature of the social sciences", adds R. M. MacIver, "that the phenomena they deal with are in part not universal but uniquely determined within the boundaries of political social areas and social unities" (XIV, 246, a). Dr. Goebbels could have phrased the sentiment in more picturesque language. The discovery of scientific principles requires detachment on the part of the intellectuals who are laboring to achieve them. But Roberto Michels denies that such detachment is possible. "It is of course true that intellectualism is not 'purely scientific' in spirit and 'universal' in passion but actively champions states, classes and fatherlands. For good or evil the scientist is no longer 'exempt from civic duties'—he is a taxpayer and must do military service; more important he has been conquered by the 'fact', the concrete, and has adapted the world of his ideas to it" (VIII, 123, b). Ginzburg sums up the result. "Both intellectually and practically there are increasing manifestations of disappointment with science. . . . Men expected an orderly progress of the arts designed to ameliorate human material conditions. Instead they find the Frankenstein of modern technology with its horrors of war and technological unemployment. As an expression of this disappointment many are urging a return to the Middle Ages, which take on all the allures of an Arcadia" (XIII, 602, a and b).

The policy of the *Encyclopaedia* itself illustrates in a quite unexpected manner the difficulties of the social scientist in attempting to escape his environment and to get outside the climate of opinion in which he finds himself. The concluding volume contains an index which is a model in arrangement and completeness. The reviewer, running through its columns, chanced upon the name of Philo Judaeus and found an excellent brief statement of his philosophical positions. A search was begun for Philo's contemporary, Paul, who wrote some letters in the first century which dealt, among other things, with social ideas and problems. It did not appear. Nor did that of the Palestinian teacher, Jesus, who is reputed to have made some contributions to social thought. Assuming that the editors were excluding prophets as a matter of policy, the reviewer continued thumbing the index until he stumbled upon the name of that good American, Joseph Smith. Joseph gets not only a mention in an article but a biography. So does Mo-

hammed. In the belief that the indexer had been careless the reviewer hastened to turn to the article on Christianity by L. T. Hobhouse only to find a very general statement of Christian social thought at different periods. The essay significantly departed from the stereotype of the *Encyclopaedia* in a failure to attempt to discover the origins of Christian social ideology. The normal article in the series emphasizes a genealogical record of ideas beginning, if possible, with one of the three great Greeks, Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle. Hobhouse mentioned none of them and even omitted Jesus and Paul. A perusal of the general introductions in Volume I, which, beginning with classical Greece, summarize the intellectual history of the Western World, disclosed the fact that the discussion of Christianity began with the institution as it existed after the fall of Rome. Historians, thoroughly competent and objective, have for more than a century been accumulating knowledge of the origins of the social ideas of the Christian religion and of its founders. When the *Encyclopaedia* can give three-quarters of a page to Joseph Smith and the origins of Mormon thought, there seem to be no scholarly grounds for excluding even a summary of the results of this research. The suppression appears to be merely another illustration of the tendency of the social scientist who is not a conscious partisan of a cause to avoid playing with dynamite. Such an omission in such a work suggests that we are nearer the Middle Ages than some of us had supposed.

The *Encyclopaedia* leaves the impression that the term "science", with anything like a strict definition, is not a proper designation for the social disciplines. The series is an exposition in fifteen volumes of the intellectual quandaries and dilemmas in which men have found themselves as they faced the problems of the relation of the individual to the group and of groups to one another. The work deals for the most part with social philosophy with emphasis on recent decades. A portion of it recounts the process of social change as manifested in the evolution of great industries. In tracing the development of thought there is too much emphasis on the old formula that Idea A begat Idea B and Idea B begat Idea C. Partly because of the space limitations of the series the student can rarely find a discussion of the social scenes or intellectual climates out of which particular philosophies have come.

Have the editors achieved their objective of stimulating cross-fertilization among the social disciplines? A partial answer may be found in the fact that there is scarcely an article in the series that is not directly useful to several members of the historical guild. But historians are notorious for the breadth of their interests. Whether the series will broaden the horizon of the specialist on income taxes depends largely on whether he has the will to read it. Certainly the editors have put at his disposal a remarkable amount of material. One of the standard assignments for all graduate students in the social disciplines should be to familiarize themselves with

the scope and character of the series. In the smaller colleges, where library facilities are limited, the importance of the series should be great. It is a library in itself and is usable for assigned course readings. One of its best features is the much criticized biographies making available information regarding important contributors to social thought in countries whose histories are commonly ignored by provincial Western Europeans and Americans.

It is possible that one day the *Encyclopaedia* will be looked upon as the valedictory of an epoch. It gathers together and summarizes the social thought of Western civilization at a time when nineteenth century liberalism appears to be fading even in England, France, and the United States. This work of twentieth century intellectuals is published when the triumphs of anti-intellectualism are increasing. Perhaps there is significance in the fact that, in general, the volumes look backward. T. V. Smith, writing on Ethics is one of the few contributors to face the future frankly. "This doctrine [pragmatic ethics] may be but the latest ethical distress signal—a signal given by morality at the contemporary crossroads—or it may be a genuine creative synthesis of authoritarian and naturalistic traditions in ethics. But at any rate there is a growing fear that, unless some effective synthesis does emerge, the impending conflict between the mutually desperate convictions of bourgeoisie and proletarian moralities may abolish all ethics in a wholesale crucifixion of the human race" (V, 606, b).

Yale University. R. H. Gabriel.

Everyman His Own Historian: Essays on History and Politics. By Carl L. Becker. (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1935. Pp. 325. $2.50.)

Carl Becker has dedicated this volume of historical papers, reviews, and casual essays chiefly to those who, by refusing to delight in everything he has said, have aided him in clarifying his ideas. No doubt a reviewer ought to approach his book in the spirit of the dedication. But this is no easy task for one who is in large part sympathetic with Mr. Becker's philosophy of history. Nor is the task made any easier by the almost hypnotic spell that Mr. Becker's way of writing casts on one's mind and mood. As nearly everyone knows by now, his style is a unique combination of mellowness and subtlety with clearness and brilliance.

While bold spirits were talking about the necessity of enlisting psychology in the service of historical writing, Carl Becker in his quiet way was actually doing so without any borrowing of strange new terms. One wonders whether any social psychologist has more effectively explained group thinking and group feeling than he has done in his essay on Kansas; or whether any psychologist has more discerningly unraveled the complicated motives of a human being than he has done in his papers on Jeremiah Wynkoop, Diderot, and Madame Roland. While the economists were taking

historians to task for their indifference toward economic influences, Mr. Becker was pointing out that most of our political troubles, domestic and international, were due to the fact that the political structure of the modern world was out of harmony with its economic organization.

Mr. Becker believes that all historians write with bias, even the most scientific ones, and that, furthermore, they are bound to write so. In spite of the fact that we are "under bond to be as honest and as intelligent as human frailty permits", we are subject to the limitations of time, place, circumstance, and purpose. What we write is a kind of "unstable pattern, redesigned and newly colored to suit the convenience of those who make use of it". In other words, the writing of history is functional to the needs of the day as those needs are felt by Mr. Everyman.

Some will not have it this way. They insist that the best historians have been, are, and must continue to be, above the battle, aloof from the exigencies of the moment. Disinterestedness, they insist, must not be abandoned for pragmatism, or for some subjective philosophy that satisfies this urge or that emotion. These historians, if they have given up their search for inexorable laws, still cling to their belief in the validity of an objective method and an almost equally objective residue.

At least a few will protest at Mr. Becker's acceptance without explicit qualification of the idea that historians are of "that ancient and honorable company of soothsayers and priests, to whom in successive ages has been entrusted the keeping of the useful myths . . . it is our function, as it was theirs, not to create, but to preserve and perpetuate social tradition". These critics will agree with James Harvey Robinson that the historian should select and emphasize those memories of the past that will impel men consciously to seek and build a more desirable future. The historian, they will say, should think of success not merely in terms of conformity to the temper of Mr. Everyman; he must under certain circumstances be a guide as well as a fellow traveler. In theory Mr. Becker would probably admit all this. Yet some may feel that in his writing, perhaps, he has been too much preoccupied with the cultivation of his own garden. These critics should not forget, however, that few historians have spoken out more frequently or more unequivocally on social and political questions.

There will be many who will not agree with Mr. Becker in some of the liberal and even radical positions that he takes. In the only previously unpublished essay included in the volume, that on the Marxist interpretation of history, Mr. Becker suggests that this interpretation of the past is very illuminating, perhaps the most illuminating one that we have had. Those who think otherwise will quite likely object also to his suggestion that perhaps liberalism is a mere way station on the road to equalitarianism. Nor will they see eye to eye with him on other matters. He has written that the intellectual liberty we prize so highly is of little moment to the average man

since he can make little use of it, and since the liberties that he can make use of are of diminishing value to him.

In these seasoned essays, so full of tolerance and warm, human sympathies, essays characterized by penetrating logic that somehow never binds his mind, Mr. Becker has taken a stand for definite human values as well as for a definite attitude toward our craft. One may accept or reject that stand, but no reflecting mind can put it lightly aside.

Smith College. MERLE CURTI.

A History of the Roumanians from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity. By R. W. SETON-WATSON, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.B.A., Masaryk Professor of Central European History in the University of London. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. viii, 596. $7.00.)

THIS is not the conventional one-volume "national history". The author has given us a study based on years of personal contact with the people he portrays and familiarity with all its printed records. It is also carefully documented; and as the style is always agreeable, one does not mind giving it the close reading which it requires.

Professor Seton-Watson deals very sanely with the question of Roumanian origins. He naturally does not believe in a heritage exclusively Roman or even mainly so, but his appeal to physiognomy as proclaiming Roman extraction is certainly convincing to anyone who has visited Roumania. And then there is the language—"essentially Latin in texture". Unhappily enough the destruction of all records in the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century leaves us without the customary types of historical evidence, and thus, as the author frankly states, "The methods inevitably adopted by the historian in his enquiry into Roumanian origins differ widely from those applicable to the early period in any other European country, even Russia or the Balkans." So also the beginnings of the Danubian Principalities are strangely obscure, the first princes being nothing more than names. The earlier centuries when the Principalities were a shuttlecock between contending powers seem to the reviewer a dreary period in Roumanian history, and there is nothing that can be done to lighten it. By the time of the Phanariots in the eighteenth century one begins to see the people behind the princes. It might be wished that the author had given us more of social history and thus have brought us to know more intimately an interesting people. But historical evidence is scanty even down to the nineteenth century. Dr. Seton-Watson has made exhaustive use of the valuable Hurmuzaki collection throughout these earlier periods, and it is gratifying to realize that, thanks to the inspiration and marvelous diligence of the Roumanian scholar, Professor N. Jorga, more and more material is being steadily brought to light.

The evolution of Roumania in the nineteenth century is treated by the author with care and understanding. He is fairly just to Cuza, though the reviewer cannot but feel that to call him "weak" and "lacking in resources" makes the colors somewhat too flat. Cuza showed at times both daring and tenacity, as was interestingly shown in his relations with the Powers. But it is quite true that he was "self-indulgent" and "lacking in method"; he was much too spasmodic to be a successful ruler, though he certainly contributed powerfully to making the country he loved a modern state. The role of Carol I is well portrayed, albeit the point might have been stressed that this able prince never became wholeheartedly Roumanian. In that period of Balkan politics which connects itself so closely with the Great War the author has used the German and Austrian documents most effectively to depict Roumanian policy. An interesting item of information for an earlier period is the fact that during the Italian War for Liberation Austria was obliged to keep a force of 30,000 in Transylvania to see that the disaffected Magyars did not get the help they wanted from the Principalities. The author has shown a well-balanced judgment throughout his study. Most students of the Eastern Question would probably agree with his censure of British policy in relation to the Balkan peoples. "British liberalism, which played so notable a part in Italian liberation, became obsessed, as soon as it crossed the Adriatic, by sordid considerations of Turkish territorial integrity and British trade in the Levant, and left all the Christian nationalities of the Near East to their fate." Doubtless the influence of habit in shaping the public mind has much to do with the promotion of outworn policies.

There are a few things one might carp at in this work but they are usually too minor to deserve a reviewer's mention. Perhaps one misleading statement might be noted. Russia's right to freedom of trade in the Black Sea and throughout the Ottoman dominions was hardly a novelty with the Peace of Adrianople. The Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji had specifically recognized this right in the Black Sea, besides allowing Russia commercial contacts with the Ottoman Empire by land and the privilege of establishing consulates wherever she chose.

Professor Seton-Watson has given us the best history of the Roumanian people in the English language and the reviewer believes that for its scope there is no other treatment that can compare with it. The book is also interspersed with interesting portraits and there is a well-selected bibliography. Its value as a book of reference would have been somewhat enhanced by a more itemized index.

The University of Texas. T. W. Riker.

Stamped and Inscribed Objects from Seleucia on the Tigris. By Robert Harbold McDowell. [University of Michigan Studies.] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935. Pp. xvii, 272. VI plates. $3.50.)

This interesting body of material comes from the five years' campaign of excavations of the University of Michigan on the site of Seleucia on the Tigris, one of the most important and least known cities of antiquity. The major part of the "stamped and inscribed objects" are clay "sealings", as the author calls them in contrast to the original seal negatives. Some of them have already been published by the author in Part IV of the *Preliminary Report upon the Excavations at Tel Umar, Iraq, conducted by the University of Michigan and the Toledo Museum of Art* (University of Michigan Press, 1931), and in Excursus III of Rostovtzeff's "Seleucid Babylonia; Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions", *Yale Classical Studies,* III (1932), 1 ff. These sealings are chiefly of two sorts, small lumps of clay with one seal-impression which were attached individually to documents, and the so-called bullae, napkin ring shaped cylinders of clay which were pressed around a rolled or folded document and which bear the impression of several seals. Almost all were found in two rooms of a Great House in the center of the city, apparently the home of a family of merchants during the third and the first half of the second centuries B. C. The documents to which the seals belonged, and which perished by fire when the Parthians captured the city, were the family's legal papers, contracts, and receipts. Some of the seals are of private persons, principals or witnesses to a transaction, others are official, showing either that the document was registered or that a tax, on salt or on slaves, had been paid. These seals, properly interpreted, supply evidence for the family's business activity, and, more important, for the "public control of business" under the Seleucid kings, for the systems of taxation and of registration. The value of such seals as a historical source has been demonstrated by Rostovtzeff in his study of the bullae from Warka, but their proper interpretation is difficult. Some of the impressions are incomplete, some are illegible, only a few are inscribed. The investigator needs a thorough acquaintance with numismatics and sigillography, the latter of which is very little developed as an exact science, with the history and administration of the Seleucid Empire, where much is controversial, and particularly with Ptolemaic Egypt, which has constantly to be used for comparison. The author, however, to a considerable extent, approaches his subject independently, tending to evaluate it without reference to parallels or modern discussion. This gives his treatment originality, and where his conclusions differ from traditional views they should not be dismissed without careful examination. It cannot help, on the other hand, occasionally leading him into error. Thus I do not believe in his "private agents of royalty", called into existence to account for a number of small seals with royal portraits. If the identification of these portraits is in all cases certain, which I doubt, certainly in the absolute monarchies of the Hellenistic period, where everything except the Greek cities and some religious establishments belonged to the king by right of conquest, there could not exist as a class such private agents, distinct from the

crown officers. All members of the state bureaucracy were, in a sense, private agents of the king.

The sealings are the most important and the most controversial part of the book. A chapter of "Miscellanea" at the end, however, adds a number of other items, two of which should be mentioned. A number of inscribed jar handles of Rhodian ware, dated by priests of Helios in the period 220–150 B. C., show the great range of Rhodian trade during this period. And one of the three fragments of inscriptions on stone is of great interest. It is a text, apparently, from the lintel of a door, giving the date of the building by the eponymous magistrates of the city, first having been named the priests of the royal cult of the Seleucid dynasty. So little evidence exists for the Seleucid dynastic cult that this new text, datable in the latter part of the third century B. C., is very welcome. For it, as for the larger results of the excavations, we can be only grateful to the University of Michigan, and we must congratulate the author on the production of a book which will be used by every student of the period.

Yale University. C. Bradford Welles.

Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Von Prof. Dr. Alfred Doren. Band I. [Handbuch der Wirtschaftsgeschichte, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Georg Brodnitz.] (Jena: Gustav Fischer. 1934. Pp. 740. 38 M.)

Doren died while his book was in the press. He had been engaged on it for nearly twenty years, however, and lived to complete a work of first-rate importance, designed and executed by a master of the field which he covered, the economic history of Italy during the Middle Ages. The difficulties of the task are obvious. The economic life of the peninsula was conditioned by a variety not only of geographical but still more of political influences which made the development extraordinarily complex. Account must be taken of contributions from the classical world, from the German invaders, from the Byzantines, from the Normans, from the Church and the papacy, and then from all the city and territorial states among which the country became divided. If seven hundred pages are all too few to give the story in detail, the author provides a wealth of references for those who seek further information; the bibliography covers nearly thirty pages, with due recognition of the contributions of Byrne, Usher, Lybyer, and other American scholars. If some questions are left unsettled the reader feels the more confidence in the judgments which the author is willing to express.

The book is divided into two parts, of which the first, less than a quarter of the whole, is given to the early Middle Ages, the Roman origins, and the changes wrought by the invasions. The author traces the transformation of social and legal relations under the pressure of economic needs. He finds a residuum of free peasants persisting in the country, but thinks it improbable

that free communes lasted through the period of invasions; he finds the origin of the communes in the early period of Lombard rule. An excursus on the different forms of rural contract (pp. 90-93) illustrates the variety of relations, and provides a helpful classification for their understanding. A connection between late Roman and medieval urban institutions, such as artisans' associations, is almost certain in Byzantine Italy, and is probable in the Lombard part of the peninsula.

The Crusades were the decisive influence which quickened the economic life of Italy, gave Italian cities leadership in world trade, and stimulated the extraordinary and hitherto unmatched development of an organization based on money, credit, and capitalism. The speed of the transformation is explained by the contact, now immediate and not indirect, with an Eastern world, wealthy and unable to defend itself. In some fifty pages the author traces the fortunes of the agricultural classes: the decline of the old landlords, the rise of free peasants and free communes, the development of the *mezzeria* which was to remain so important in the later history. Incidentally, he contests the American origin of maize, which was cultivated, he believes, in medieval Italy.

In the last and largest part of the book the author describes the highly developed economic life of the last centuries of the Middle Ages: foreign and domestic trade, manufacture as shaped first by the guilds and later transformed by capitalism, banking and finance, economic theory and policy. This list of topics will suggest to a student of the economic history of northwestern Europe how rich is the material offered him for a comparative study of origins and developments; and even in Italy itself the varied history of the different cities, admirably treated by the author, suggests instructive comparisons. In Italy is to be found, as the author says, the original "merchant adventurer", using that term in its broadest sense, an Italian type lacking still the religious basis for his activities but freed at least from the restrictions of tradition; in the Italian cities appeared for the first time in the modern world a proletariat.

Yale University. CLIVE DAY.

Das Heerwesen der germanischen Frühzeit, des Frankenreiches, und des ritterlichen Zeitalters. Von EUGEN VON FRAUENHOLZ. [Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Heerwesens.] (Munich: C. H. Beck. 1935. Pp. xiii, 306. 16 M.)

THIS work is the ninth volume in a "Kriegs- und Heeresgeschichte" series under the general editorship of the author of this volume. I have not seen any of the others, but if they are at all similar to this in spirit and tenor the fact may be deprecated, for under the outward guise of serious and scientifically written history this book is German war propaganda. The learning displayed is a mere façade which screens a battery of guns and all the panoply

of war. Indeed, Herr Frauenholz does not attempt to conceal his purpose from anyone who may read his preface. For he writes:

A military system (Heerwesen) is not an independent structure, but probably the strongest and most precise expression of the being (Wesen) of a nation and a state. For, just as war—the *examen rigorosum* of nations—permits of no concealment, but brings out with splendid clarity and stupendous distinctness the strength and weakness of state and people, so in the building up of a military defense (Wehrkraft) there appears the people's attitude toward the state and the strength of its will-to-live. . . . The evolution of the European military system shows five great periods: the period of the popular folk army; that of the knightly army of quality (ritterlichen Qualitätsheere); the phase of professional soldiery (reinen Söldtnertums), the epoch of the incorporation of a standing mercenary army into the state; and finally the period in which there is a return to universal military service. . . . Universal military service in recent times has been deeply conceived and most joyfully received by the Germans, not so much on the political as on the military side. The French, who are more warlike than military, and chiefly think politically, have accepted this policy reluctantly, and with interruptions, and have made this idea their own in a different way. It is a question which will be examined in these pages whether the new German state rests upon a different spiritual foundation than other European states; if the strong urge on the part of us Germans for personal freedom(!)—which stands in a certain contradiction to the German concept of honor-in-arms (militärische Waffenehre)—is basic to the specific German state, or is a hindrance to the development of the state's power. . . . The purpose of this work is to indicate . . . the relations between army, state, and folk (pp. v-viii).

This work covers the epoch of medieval history. Dr. Frauenholz makes a brave display of erudition, but he certainly does not wholly understand the nature of warfare in the feudal age of Germany. On page 65 he cites the battle of the Dyle in 891 when Emperor Arnulf destroyed the entrenched camp of the Norsemen in Flanders as evidence that so early military service on horseback was universal. This is hardly true at all of Saxony even two hundred years later, and not wholly true of Swabia *ca.* 900. In Otto I's army which invaded France in 946 there were contingents of Saxon infantry, raw peasant levies with rudimentary accounterment and wearing homemade straw hats (Widukind, III, 2; Opera Ratherii Ver., p. 310; Vogel, Ratherius von Verona, I, 260). The army with which Henry II invaded Poland in 1004 contained many Saxon footmen, and the same is true of that which he led into Italy (Thietmar, Chron., VI, cc. viii, x). Moreover, Dr. Frauenholz blunders when he contends that as early as the end of the ninth century the military benefice system prevailed in Germany. Except in the case of church lands the benefice system was not widely spread until late. This accounts for the preponderance of church vassals in the armies which followed the emperors over the Alps. If Dr. Frauenholz, when reading the Annals of Fulda, *anno* 891, had turned a few pages backward to the year 880, he would have discovered that in an engagement with the Norsemen in that

year two bishops, twelve counts, and eighteen 'satellites' perished. These last were armed *ministeriales* or *milites gregarii,* and men of servile origin, whose class was outside of the feudal regime. The names given them reveal their base origin. By 1134 we find mention of the *ordo equestris major* and the *ordo equestris minor,* the one composed of beneficed nobles, the other composed of armed ministerials.

The only portion of this book of value to the historian is the appendix, which fills one half the work and consists of the most important documents of a military bearing on German history from Merovingian times to the fifteenth century. This is a convenient compilation. Unless, however, my calculation is at fault, in the analysis of the muster roll of 981 (Beilage xli) there is an error. I make out the total forces 1990 instead of 2090, of which 1482 were ecclesiastical vassals instead of 1504, and 508 lay vassals instead of 586. But a graver error than a mere arithmetical mistake is herein involved. Dr. Frauenholz fails to understand that these lay vassals were 'vollehen', *i.e.,* that they held *fiefs du haubert,* which implied the service of at least twelve other vassals under each of the 508 great vassals, which would make the lay contingents alone of this roster amount to over six thousand.

The University of California. James Westfall Thompson.

Histoire des Croisades et du Royaume franc de Jérusalem. Par *René* Grousset. Tome I, *L'anarchie musulmane et la monarchie franque.* Tome II, *Monarchie franque et monarchie musulmane: L'équilibre.* (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1934; 1935. Pp. lxii, 698; iii, 921. 60; 80 fr.)

The first two volumes of this history of the Crusades and the Latin colonies ends with the Battle of Hattîn (1187). In a final volume the narrative will be continued to 1291. Such lengthy treatment of the subject, if well done, would be most welcome. Unfortunately, these volumes make little or no contribution to our knowledge. Furthermore, they are written with much exaggeration of the theses by which the movement is interpreted. The author, who has turned to the much worked field of the Crusades from not very closely related Oriental studies, has adopted Chalondon's idea that the movement has been considered too much from the Occidental side. Without accepting, or at least examining, what has been said in criticism of this viewpoint, he has assumed that the West, which has been so much studied, may be entirely neglected. His work, therefore, deals only with what happened in the East.

The first part of Volume I (pp. 1–163) is largely devoted to a defense of Byzantine rights. The Greeks, so the argument runs, because of their tenth century crusade, had prior rights to the crusading idea, and held a mortgage on Antioch. When the Seljuks conquered nearly all of Asia Minor, the Greeks needed help from the West. The Westerners became mercenaries of

the emperor (Çhalondon's idea) and had no right to forget this role. The decision of Alexius to leave the Westerners in the lurch at Antioch should make the historian grieve, M. Grousset says (p. 100), for the First Crusade was only a 'historic accident' (p. 163) which succeeded because of the weakness of the Greeks and the anarchy in the Mohammedan world. In other words, it interfered with what should have been Byzantine manifest destiny.

Inasmuch as it did succeed, the author's pro-Byzantine attitude gives way to French patriotism. He finds consolation in the idea that the founders of the Latin states were the first of French colonists. Even the 'Pullani', he labels 'early French Creoles'. The Lotharingians who went to Syria ceased to be Germans and became French. "La royauté fondée à Jérusalem par la maison Lotharingie-Boulogne, le royaume latin de Jérusalem, sera un royaume français" (p. 12). M. Grousset sees these early kings, although transferred to a very different environment from that of France, developing political conceptions identical with those held by Capetians who lived much later. The political genius of Baldwin I constructed 'a coherent feudal hierarchy', "un État véritable à la manière du royaume capétien de France" (pp. 306–307). Baldwin II was a "Philippe-Auguste d'outre-mer" (p. 586), who exercised "un prestige juridique et moral analogue à celui que devait obtenir en France, par les mêmes vertus, notre Louis IX" (pp. 641–642). The book contains many such examples of extreme generalization, which stamp it as a popular, rather than a scholarly, work.

The plan has merit, for although it necessitates considerable repetition, it does present a well-balanced view of the whole Eastern situation. But the author has depended too much on secondary works such as Chalondon for the First Crusade and the *Encyclopédie de l'Islam* for Mohammedan affairs. There is no bibliography, and the footnotes consist of rather erratic references to sources, which indicate that the author has made no special effort to use the best editions. Thus he mentions (footnote on page 1) the Tudebode of the *Recueil* and not the superior *Gesta* later edited by Hagenmeyer and Bréhier. William of Tyre, although the author admits that he copied the first part of his history, is the most used source. The text is filled with quotations from the thirteenth century French translation of this work, which M. Grousset admires for its 'belle langue'.

In the second volume the author gives an interesting story of the diplomatic and political history of the Latin states, but, as in the first volume, makes frequent misleading statements about institutions. The Jerusalemite monarchy, it would seem, must be made to fit the pattern which he has in mind for the Capetian state. One brief quotation will indicate M. Grousset's imaginative possibilities. Quoting an interpolation of William of Tyre's thirteenth century translator, the author suggests that Amaury I, if he had lived, might have asked the pope to expel the Templars from the East and

to dissolve the order. "Amaury I^er^ devançant de cent trente-cinq ans l'acte de Philippe le Bel! Notons seulement que, si une telle mesure avait été effectivement prise en 1174, treize ans plus tard le désastre de Hattîn et la chute du royaume de Jérusalem auraient sans doute été évités" (p. 602).

Volume I contains four tables and three maps. The index will appear in the last volume. The second volume has six appendixes containing critical notes, four genealogical tables, and seven maps. It has no bibliography, and the footnotes, as in the first volume, give little indication of any wide use of sources or secondary works.

The University of Texas. FREDERIC DUNCALF.

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., D.Litt., Collegii Corporis Christi praesidem, et H. M. ALLEN. Tom. VIII, *1529–1530.* Compendium vitae P. S. Allen addidit H. W. GARROD, M.A., Collegii Mertonensis socius et bibliothecarius. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xliv, 516. $10.00.)

ON February 7, 1932, Dr. P. S. Allen wrote me: "We are hard at work on our volume VIII, and have about half in type now". Three months later he wrote me the last of a good many letters thanking me for some information about a manuscript and signing himself, "Tuus ex grato animo PSA". In neither of these letters was there any allusion to the serious surgical operation from which he was recovering. Two attacks of influenza, however, brought on a streptococcal infection of which he died on June 16, 1933. But his great work was not to stop. "My husband charged me", Mrs. Allen wrote me on March 18, 1934, "to finish Erasmus, and proposed that his friend Mr. Garrod, Fellow-librarian of Merton, should share the task. . . . Volume VIII is nearly through the press. There are still two and a half volumes to follow, for which the material is already collected".

As a fitting preface to this volume Mr. H. W. Garrod has contributed a life of his friend, written in beautiful Latin and with deep affection. His final judgment, "Allen meo quidem judicio propius ceteris hominibus quos novi omnibus ad normam sapientis et boni viri accedebat", expresses much my own feeling. And Allen was one of the most accomplished scholars of our own, or of any, age.

To the true Erasmian each new volume of the *Opus epistolarum* brings a feast. In them he will meet his old friends in a new and more beautiful dress; and in them he will find a wealth of new treasure. The outlines, the great facts, he knew before; now at last he can fairly batten on detail.

The first five letters to be printed in this volume are supplements belonging chronologically to earlier periods. First of all comes a recently discovered letter to Luther, of August 1, 1520. Next is a letter to Spalatin, written at the time of the Diet of Worms, in which the Humanist exclaims: "You could hardly believe how the people, and even all the most learned men, love Luther. Some Dominicans and Carmelites bellow against him in public in such wise as to betray their own cause and that of the pope and to help Luther. Would that Leo and Charles knew how their battle was being waged! They would loose their thunders against such agents".

The regular series of letters in this volume covers the period from January, 1529, to July, 1530. In April, 1529, Erasmus left Basel on account of the iconoclastic riots and Protestant innovations of which he gives several lively reports. With the aid of these letters, of the documents recently printed by Dürr in his *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der basler Reformation,* and of the new edition of the letters of Oecolampadius, a fresh and accurate history of the Protestant Revolution at Basel could profitably be written.

Through tumults and peace, through sickness and health, Erasmus kept busy with new works and with revisions of old ones. In one preface (ep. 2095) never reprinted since 1529 and apparently totally lost to sight until Allen resurrected it, Erasmus gives a long list of corrigenda to previous works, being warned in a dream, which he vividly describes, that his time on earth is coming to a close and that presently he would be invited "to emigrate to a field of such beauty as no mortal speech could tell".

Among the prefaces or commendatory letters here to be found are two that will especially interest Americans. George Agricola's *De re metallica,* translated into English of late by Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Hoover, Erasmus describes as "delightful because of its novel subject, enlivening because of its refined wit, and couched in a simple style recalling the Attic manner" (ep. 2274). The *De civilitate morum,* as Dr. Allen reminds us in his note on a letter here reprinted (ep. 2282), was shown by Mr. Charles Moore to be the basis, through a French Jesuit treatise, of George Washington's *Rules of Civility.* Another preface here reprinted (ep. 2091) is that to the second edition of Seneca's works, which furnished the groundwork of Calvin's first publication, a commentary on the *De clementia.* Of Calvin's indebtedness to Erasmus, and of his criticisms, Dr. Allen speaks, without mentioning the recent interesting studies of the subject by Pannier and Breen.

Not the least interesting of the letters of these years are those dealing with Henry VIII and his great divorce. First comes a letter to Cochlaeus (who was preparing material for his war of pens with Henry) testifying to the king's ability as a scholar and Latinist. To prove the latter Erasmus enclosed an epistle received by himself from Henry when he was in Italy. This letter, as the Humanist must have known when he got it, was really

written by a Latin secretary; it is more charitable, and probably more correct, to suppose that this fact escaped the memory of the old man, rather than to accept the alternative of direct falsehood on his part. Then comes a request to Boniface Amerbach, as a jurist, for an opinion on Henry's grounds for divorce, and the long letter in reply (ep. 2267) refusing to recognize adequate legal justification, rejecting Luther's suggestion of a way out by bigamy, and suggesting adoption of an heir as the proper solution of the question. Finally, we have an assertion by the Humanist (ep. 2315) that when Queen Catherine asked him to write her a tract on *Christian Marriage* he did not know (as has sometimes been thought) that a divorce threatened her.

Other topics of interest cry for mention—the Diet of Augsburg, the Ciceronian battle, the strife with the Spanish monks, and the treatment of the Anabaptists. But I must close this long review with noting two small slips in a work as nearly faultless as any produced by consummate scholarship. Mr. Garrod has fallen into error in calling J. K. F. Knaake "notus editione Lutheri Epistularum" (p. ix). Knaake started and for fourteen years (1883–1897) directed the Weimar edition of Luther's works, from which, however, the epistles were then excluded because of the Enders edition contemporary with them. Long after Knaake's death and after the completion of the Enders edition, other scholars began to republish Luther's correspondence in the Weimar works. Knaake, however, seriously began work on Erasmus's letters, and solved some source problems in a study which later fell into Dr. Allen's hands. The other slight error is in a note to a line of Boniface Amerbach: "Lutherus Novum Testamentum in linguam latinam transtulit". Allen follows an earlier editor of Amerbach in calling this an error, and in saying "Luther made no Latin translation of the N.T." As a matter of fact, however, Amerbach was well informed. A Latin Bible, without Luther's name but publicly acknowledged by him as his own revision of the Vulgate, was printed at Wittenberg in 1529.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth Century France, 1620–1680. By HARCOURT BROWN, M.A., Ph.D. [History of Science Society.] (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Company. 1934. Pp. xxii, 306, $3.00.)

THE decades covered by the studies included in this volume are very important in the history of science. During these years three of the best-known scientific organizations came into being, the Accademia del Cimento of Florence, the Académie des Sciences of Paris, and the Royal Society of London. Contemporaneous with their beginnings was the rise of the scientific periodical, notably the *Journal des Savants* in Paris and the *Philosophical Transactions* in London. Dr. Brown's volume is a worthy addition to the

accumulating efforts at probing more deeply into the work of the academies and like bodies, active in the middle years of seventeenth century France. He throws considerable light on the succession of minor associations and assemblies that preceded the Académie des Sciences. The most important of the numerous private academies was that of the Dupuys. More popular in character were the conferences of the Bureau d'Addresse under Renaudot and Mersenne. The immediate background of the Académie des Sciences was the Montmor Academy; it ended in the mid-sixties just before Colbert's creation of its royal successor.

Abundant evidence is given to show that there was a real republic of letters for men of scientific interests in seventeenth century Europe. Much interchange of views and experiments took place. The rise of the Royal Society in 1660, however, does not seem to have been stimulated particularly by the Montmor Academy. The Royal Society, on the contrary, served as an example to the French scientists who were working for a royal establishment. French example, on the other hand, is definitely found in the appearance of the *Philosophical Transactions* a few months after the beginning of the *Journal des Savants*. A number of hitherto obscure followers of the Gassendist tradition, notably Petit, Thévenot, and Auzout, are more fully treated than heretofore, and the international importance of men like Mersenne, Oldenburg, and Justel is clearly shown. The new academies profited greatly from the incessant correspondence, later supplemented by journals, of the scientifically minded. The author has made this clear by numerous excerpts from manuscript material, hitherto but slightly used.

The volume is compact. The continuity of the narrative is sometimes unduly interrupted by long quotations and discussions of sources that would better appear as footnotes. Some inclusions seem of doubtful value, for example, those on pages 190 and 195–197. The letter of Bayle to Boyle, printed in the appendix, is interesting but hardly relevant unless Bayle's *News of the Republic of Letters* be given a larger place in the account. Hoskyns's letter to Bayle, sending Willoughby's *History of Birds*, has long been in print. The volume does not pretend to be a complete picture of scientific organizations in seventeenth century France. It is, however, a very valuable addition to the accumulating knowledge on this subject. There is a useful bibliography appended to the study; occasionally, insufficient bibliographical data are given for books listed.

The Ohio State University. HOWARD ROBINSON.

Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638–1647. Edited, with a Commentary, by WILLIAM HALLER, Associate Professor of English in Barnard College, Columbia University. Volume I, *Commentary;*

volumes II and III, *Facsimiles.* [Records of Civilization, Austin P. Evans, General Editor.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1934. Pp. xiv, 197; 339; 405. $12.50.)

THESE volumes constitute a scholarly edition of nineteen Puritan tracts selected by Professor Haller to illustrate the growth of liberal ideas during the period of the civil war. An able commentary in the first volume describes each tract in turn and shows its place in the great debate; and the work as a whole provides an admirable point of departure for a study of the Puritan pamphleteers.

These pamphlets follow the evolution of advanced Puritan thought toward toleration in religion and democracy in politics. The earliest tracts in the collection appeared before 1642 and are primarily attacks upon the Anglican bishops. But one of them, by Lord Brooke, is something more and adds an eloquent plea that the more radical Puritan groups should at least be heard. Here is moderate Puritanism in a very attractive form, tempered by the urbanity of a scholarly artistocrat. Two tracts by Henry Parker and John Goodwin seek a logical basis for taking up arms against the king. They advance the idea of a social contract which Charles has broken and proclaim a natural law of self-protection justifying resistance to oppression. Several pamphlets deal with the conflict of Presbyterians and Independents over the reconstruction of the Church. An interesting tract by five dissentient Independents in the Westminster Assembly champions the freedom of individual congregations against Presbyterian centralization; and this idea is carried further in a tract by John Goodwin declaring that there is something of God in all the sects which Presbyterianism will crush at its peril. This tract is a distinct approach to political democracy. Liberty of conscience as a natural right is defended by Roger Williams, William Walwyn, and Henry Robinson who, as a practical man of business, finds persecution disastrous to trade. Tracts by John Lilburne, Walwyn, and Richard Overton illustrate the evolution of the Levelers. They defend the radical sects by an appeal to liberty of conscience and attack intolerance in Presbyterians and Independents alike. They are more political in tone, declaring the rights of men to complete liberty and equality in church and state and making every man his own king, priest, and prophet. Parliament is but the servant of the masses from whom it derives its authority. The story is not carried beyond 1647.

Professor Haller's work rests solidly upon a wide acquaintance with Puritan literature and is, on the whole, excellent. It is unfortunate, however, in the opinion of this reviewer, that the editor reproduces facsimiles of the tracts rather than rendering them in modern print, in which old capitals, spelling, and punctuation could easily have been preserved. The reproduction of such a mass of old printing, of no great typographical interest, does not appear to serve any useful purpose commensurate with the hardship it

inflicts upon the reader. The facsimiles, moreover, contain no figures or other symbols referring to the notes which are all in volume one. To use the notes, therefore, the reader must begin with the note and then locate the passage in the text to which the note refers. This criticism, however, is a matter of opinion and does not obscure the fact that Professor Haller has produced a scholarly and useful work.

The University of Minnesota. DAVID HARRIS WILLSON.

Calendar of Treasury Books, preserved in the Public Record Office: Introduction to Volumes XI-XVII, covering the years 1695–1702. Prepared by WILLIAM A. SHAW, Litt.D. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1934. Pp. dciv. £1 17*s.* 6*d.*)

IN form an introduction to seven volumes of the *Calendar of Treasury Books,* this volume is in fact a brilliant study of public finance during that critical period in English history from 1695 to 1702. The evidence printed in the calendar volumes is amplified by references to the Statutes, the Commons' Journal, accounts of debates, and the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum.

Dr. Shaw analyzes both the costs of the civil government, for which the king was responsible, and the costs of the wars, for which the Parliament assumed responsibility, in elaborate tables of income and expenditure. The treatment of the king in the matter of his civil list by the Parliament in its conscious pursuit of the policy of making the crown more dependent on Parliament is characterized by Dr. Shaw as reeking of duplicity. By a succession of measures covering many years the Commons "defrauded (there is no other word for it) the King of his Customs revenue and of his property in the Hereditary and Temporary Excise. . . . the House never gave him sufficient to run the Civil Government of the country nor would they relieve him of the responsibility for the upkeep of it. And even after promising or professing to provide him with means to perform that duty they had gradually filched the bulk of those means from him." As a result William died in debt to the sum of over £800,000 on the civil list alone, most of which was never paid.

The war completed the separation of the military and naval expenditures from the civil list, and circumstances resulted in annual parliamentary appropriations for the army and the navy. Dr. Shaw feels that the constitutional revolution of the reign is really summed up in this responsibility of the Parliament for the support of the fighting services by annual appropriations. For this development was accompanied by the introduction of annual estimates, parliamentary guarantees of loans, and parliamentary inspection of accounts. In these devices we have the mechanism by which the responsibility to Parliament of the executive departments, beginning with the treas-

ury board, was brought about. The practice of public finance seems to have had as much and more to do with the future of the constitution as the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement.

Among the detailed studies which Dr. Shaw appends to his general discussion are those of the Land Bank of 1696, the parliamentary sinking fund provision for deficiencies on guaranteed loans, which aimed to pay off deficits within a short period, the great recoinage of 1696, the invention and employment of that early form of paper money known as exchequer bills, the commission of public accounts, the experiments with annuities and lotteries, and the state of the national debt at the close of William's reign.

In only one point do Dr. Shaw's views seem open to the suggestion of modification. It is hard to reconcile with the statement that Parliament was really generous in its support of the war the extraordinary expedients of loans, annuities, lotteries, the robbery of the royal till, and a deficit of two and a half million pounds handed on to Anne's administration. Rather Parliament was up to its early Stuart trick of buying its cake, keeping its penny, and hoping that someone else would pay.

The University of Illinois. F. C. Dietz.

John Law: Oeuvres complètes. Publiées pour la première fois par Paul Harsin, professeur à l'Université de Liége. Trois tomes. (Paris: Recueil Sirey. 1934. Pp. lxxxviii, 221; 327; 432. 150 fr.)

John Law stands close to the historical origins of the question that in our own day continues, it would seem increasingly, to baffle us: What is money? and especially, What are the socially useful limits of possible modifications of its forms and functions? It is comparatively easy to find in Law's writings particular conclusions that have been rendered untenable by the advance of financial and general economic analysis and experience. The problem that he posed and faced with such ill success remains. Mississippi Bubbles continue to explode about our devoted ears in numbers and volumes and intensities such as Law's world could not and would not have endured. Later men must still "stand amazed" at

> "Our intricate finance that would not fit
> For all our wit
> In any pattern save foretold disaster's."

In the recent survey of research work in progress among members of the American Historical Association, only one scholar, already involved in highly significant work not likely soon to be terminated, acknowledged having in contemplation a study of John Law. In contrast to the American situation, a lively group of European scholars, Italian, German, Dutch, and English, as well as French and Belgian, have built up an impressive body of Law

scholarship. Of these, Professor Paul Harsin, by his energy and the breadth of his plans, bids fair to achieve the definitive formulation of Law's work for our time. He has been especially fortunate in adding to the list of the known works by Law and, as well, to the list of known contemporary criticisms of Law. It was, therefore, particularly appropriate that Professor Harsin should undertake the publication of the "complete works".

The work in question embodies the *documents justificatives,* so to speak, of a larger project. As planned, this is to include the publication of the *Réflexions politiques sur les finances et le commerce* of Dutot, the cashier of the India Company and Law's severest critic, and of a list of the pamphlets of the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century which may have entered into the formation of Law's ideas. The whole is to culminate in a large-scale history of the "System", the general conception of which has already appeared in the *History of the Principal Public Banks,* edited by J. G. Van Dillen (see the review which follows).

Professor Harsin has consequently postponed any discussion of Law's doctrine. His long introduction is restricted to establishing the provenience and the diplomatic relations of his documents. This he has done with a great deal of care. Although it is not always necessary to agree with his conclusions, in every case all the elements of a decision are presented. In general, M. Harsin, as indeed seems desirable, is inclined to include all that could possibly be attributed to Law. It is not clear why he omitted two documents which he himself published a few years ago with a tentative attribution to Law. M. Harsin has also, in principle, omitted all correspondence not of economic or financial interest, although, again fortunately, he has included much in the third volume that embodies merely Law's juridical and political arguments for his rehabilitation. On the other hand, in view of these omissions, it is not easy to justify devoting eighty-three pages to a new and independent translation into French (incidentally, an excellent one) of the *Money and Trade Considered* of 1705.

It is to be hoped that Professor Harsin does not remain without emulators. John Law is spectacular material, but Daniel Defoe has more rather than less to tell us of the economic world of which he was such an acute observer. Such a collection as this of his economic writings would be at least equally precious.

The University of Wyoming. F. L. Nussbaum.

History of the Principal Public Banks accompanied by Extensive Bibliographies of the History of Banking and Credit in Eleven European Countries. Collected by J. G. Van Dillen, Secretary to the International Committee for the Study of the History of Banking and Credit. [Contributions to the History of Banking, collected by J. G. Van

Dillen, I.] (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1934. Pp. xii, 480. 12 Gld.)

In this, a single volume of 480 pages, Mr. Van Dillen has collected twelve essays on the history of European public banks from the thirteenth to the nineteenth centuries. It is the most useful volume on the subject that has yet appeared. The book is trilingual, the essays being in French, German, and English. I pass over without comment, because they do not add much that is new to the subjects treated, the essays on Law's System; the foundation of the Bank of France; the Netherlands Bank; public banks of Spain; banking in Geneva and the Bank of St. George; fiduciary issues in Poland; and the antecedents of the Russian State Bank.

Luzzato, in an essay on the public banks of Venice, and Van Dillen, in a discussion of the Bank of Amsterdam, have analyzed new material. It is the recurrent story of issues on behalf of the state, advances in excess of deposits, overexpansion, and the like. The records of the Bank of Amsterdam also reveal that the bank did not make excessive loans to the East India Company in the eighteenth century as both Mees and Dunbar have stated.

Heckscher's essay on the Bank of Sweden, largely based on the voluminous official histories of the bank, makes available in English for the first time the essentials of the history of that famous institution. The author tells his story well, mixing choice historical morsels with brilliant interpretation. He alone of all the contributors uses history as a means to illustrate and advance the theory of money. Particularly valuable are his comments on the short-lived inflation bacillus of 1661–1664; on the struggle between the "Hats" who sponsored inflation and large public expenditures for nationalistic purposes and the "Caps" who, when they came into power, brought about deflation and curtailment of expenditures; and on the failure of the bank to use the mechanism of the bank rate to adjust supply and demand for funds.

Perhaps the most valuable essay is that of Dr. Richards on the "First Fifty Years of the Bank of England" (pp. 201–272). He had the enviable opportunity of examining the Minute Books of the Court of Directors and of the Proprietors of the Bank of England, a privilege of which he made thorough and sound use. He explodes the myth that Patterson played an important and honorable part in the early history of the bank and he disproves Macaulay's statement that the goldsmiths were antagonistic to the bank. They were in fact among the earliest depositors, the relation between the bank and other banks and bankers being both friendly and co-operative. Dr. Richards presents and analyzes new material on every important activity of the bank: note issue, relations with traders and the treasury, foreign activities, public debt management, inter-banking accommodation, and capital promotion. I particularly recommend for the reader's consideration the discussion of issuing experiments (pp. 219–230).

In short, this is a valuable book for historian and economist. It has one drawback, however. Having to jump from German to English to French as the reader moves on from one essay to another, is something of a nuisance and detracts from the pleasure otherwise offered by this volume.

Harvard University. S. E. HARRIS.

Marie-Antoinette et Barnave: Correspondance secrète, juillet 1791–janvier 1792. Première édition complète établie d'après les originaux par ALMA SÖDERHJELM, professeur à l'Université suédoise d'Abo. [Les classiques de la Révolution française, publiés sous la direction d'Albert Mathiez et Georges Lefebvre.] (Paris: Armand Colin. 1934. Pp. ix, 257. 30 fr.)

IN 1913 O. G. Heidenstam published, under the title, *Marie-Antoinette, Fersen, et Barnave,* some of the Alex Fersen papers deposited at Löfstad, including a political correspondence between Marie-Antoinette and Barnave following upon the return of the queen from Varennes. The work was at once subjected to a drastic criticism by H. Glagau (*Die Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik*), in which the author endeavored to prove that the letters were spurious; and in a later article he went so far as to charge Heidenstam with forging them. This was the beginning of one of those literary polemics that from time to time enliven the academic world. Among those who participated were Wilhelm Munthe, Ferdinand de Brinon, Mathiez, Welvert, and Miss E. D. Bradby. Meantime, two Swedish experts, having examined the originals, pronounced the letters genuine. In spite of this the prevailing opinion was that the genuineness of the letters was doubtful, although few critics were disposed to charge Heidenstam with their concoction. Long after the controversy had subsided, James Westfall Thompson published (*English Historical Review*, vol. XLVII) an admirable brief summary of the affair, and reached the just conclusion that there was no adequate ground for supposing the letters spurious, that the Heidenstam version of them was not to be trusted, and that what was chiefly needed was a "complete and critical edition of the Fersen papers".

That need is now fulfilled only in part, but the "affaire Heidenstam" is at least settled. Mlle. Söderhjelm proves conclusively that the correspondence between Marie Antoinette and Barnave is genuine, but that the Heidenstam version of it is entirely unreliable. The letters, ninety-nine in number, run from July, 1791, to January, 1792, are presented in chronological order and supplied with the necessary explanatory comment; so that both the real and the ostensible policy of the queen in her dealings with the constitutionals can be easily followed. Generally speaking, the result is merely to confirm the traditional view that the queen was stringing Barnave; her real object, as she says in letters to Fersen, was to "manage the constitutionals, to put them to

sleep" pending the necessary preparations for suppressing the Revolution by force. Certain minor points are made clear. The letters happen to be in Sweden, as any one might guess, because the queen turned the correspondence over to Fersen. The lack of formality with which Barnave addressed the queen, the "rudeness" of which Miss Bradby thought him incapable, was adopted at the express command of the queen: this after all was not a social correspondence coming within the purview of a manual of etiquette. In addition, the letters as now printed do nothing to enhance the reputation for political wisdom of either the queen or of Barnave. Barnave was naïve, not because he fell in love with the queen on the famous ride from Varennes to Paris, but because he had long since fallen in love with "philosophie" and was therefore, like so many other leaders in the Revolution, incapable of distinguishing the virtues of man from the impulses of men. The queen, poor lady, endeavoring to save the monarchy, did what she could to destroy it because both training and character made it impossible for her to understand the Revolution in any other sense than as a *Jacquerie* in which a naturally loyal people had been led astray by clever *frondeurs*. It has been said that military men are always fighting the last instead of the present war. It may likewise be said of politicians and statesmen that they usually adapt their measures to the last instead of to the impending crisis.

Cornell University. CARL BECKER.

Maximilien Robespierre: a Study in Deterioration. By Reginald Somerset Ward. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xi, 359. $6.50.)

PROFESSIONAL historians of modern Europe have nowadays little occasion to make use of the conventional vocabulary of Christian theology. It is therefore with some surprise that one discovers that Mr. Ward devotes his book to the deterioration of Robespierre's soul and that he proposes to measure that deterioration by Robespierre's failure to live up to Democracy, the reflection on earth of the Love of God, Virtue, the reflection of the Righteousness of God, Thoroughness, the reflection of the Perfection of God, and a number of uncapitalized and presumably less important abstractions. And yet Mr. Ward has written a life of Robespierre which seems to a fairly worldly reviewer to be in many ways the most balanced, the most sensible, the most plausible we possess. Long survival seems often to have the effect of making theological and metaphysical generalizations less opaque to mere sense experience, and Mr. Ward's use of "soul" (a use which, as so often in practical, parish Christianity has a Pelagian touch) permits him to see human beings more clearly than would the use of newer and much more obstinate abstractions like "l'homme machine" for instance. Mr. Ward sees Robes-

pierre better through his mature Christian theology than Mathiez ever did through his immature Marxian theology. In fact, undogmatic Christian moral judgments have not infrequently had in various hands for the last few centuries a range of toleration, an elasticity, a regard for the senses, a subtlety equal to the best work of pagans. Mr. Ward's Robespierre emerges a believable human being and a believable prophet, not entirely explicable in psychiatric terms. Mr. Ward has obviously not quite dared to avoid recourse to modern psychology and he uses its terminology with a winning awkwardness, and on the whole with surprising success. Here again his quality of Christian moralist has saved him from the cruder simplicities of this somewhat ambitious and very new science.

Mr. Ward has been very careful about his facts; he has fully paid his respects to the discipline of history as established by the nineteenth century. His footnotes, generous in quantity and orthodox in position, are unfortunately printed according to an ingenious system of abbreviations, which no doubt does save time and money for author and publisher, but like all such systems, loses time for the reader. French experts, who are very fond of remarking that "M. X is unfortunately quite ignorant of the historical background of the French Revolution" will not be able to do so with justice to Mr. Ward's book. His bibliography, which is limited to books actually referred to in the text, is as complete as one could wish. On a minor but highly controversial point—Robespierre's jaw wound—he marshals some new analysis, and concludes very positively against the hypothesis of attempted suicide. For the most part, however, the book is new not in its materials, but in the spirit in which it is written. Style and narrative are both sober, but far from dull and unattractive.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

L'empire égyptien sous Ismaïl et l'ingérence anglo-française, 1863–1879. Par M. SABRY, docteur ès lettres de l'Université de Paris, professeur à l'École normale supérieure du Caire. [Épisode de la question d'Afrique.] (Paris: Paul Geuthner. 1934. Pp. 570. 75 fr.)

FOR more than half a century it has been customary to regard Ismail, viceroy of Egypt, 1863–1879, as little more than a profligate wastrel and easy-going voluptuary. Such an estimate was deliberately fostered by Lord Cromer and other British officials, probably for the better justification of British policy in Egypt. The substantial shares of spoil taken from the Nile Valley by the nationals of various European states during the "consular era" which followed the reign of Mehemet Ali, when the seventeen European consulates in Egypt functioned as so many local governments, contributed in the same manner to the bad reputation of the prince most thoroughly de-

spoiled. However, in recent years, Ismail and his Egyptian contemporaries have acquired new characters in the writings of a small group of historians, notably Crabitès, Douin, and Sabry. Among these "revisionists", Sabry, in the work under review, has done most to lift the veil from the unbridled orgy of plundering indulged in by European agents in Egypt and to place Ismail and those associated with him in proper perspective.

As Sabry points out, Mehemet Ali had retained a firm hold on Egypt by resisting the influx of foreign capital. When his well-intentioned successors were prevailed upon to undertake the development of their country with European funds, the financial insolvency of Egypt became merely a question of time. Such an outcome was hoped for by both Great Britain and France, according to Sabry. Each of them after 1841 was seeking pretexts for the annexation of Egypt, from which convenient base the remainder of Africa might be partitioned.

Sabry dwells on the major part played by the Suez Canal undertaking in the betrayal and ruin of the Egyptian viceroyalty. Touching lightly on the now fairly familiar diplomatic history of the project, he gives a fearless, detailed, and illuminating account, based on a thorough examination of French and Egyptian records, of the financial transactions which took place from the time of the first canal concession. He finds conclusive evidence that De Lesseps, trusted by both Said and Ismail, was an unscrupulous trickster, and, because of the enormous sums he extorted under one pretext or another, was an important factor in the subsequent financial debacle of the country. "One can now understand", says Sabry, "why the concession of the Canal and its dependencies to De Lesseps produced on England the same effect as the invasion of Bonaparte" (p. 80).

His hope of achieving by the expenditure of money the independence his grandfather sought to gain by force of arms is apparent in every involved financial transaction of the khedive. In pursuance of this hope Ismail's fatalism and the deep designs of European governments combined to accelerate the approach of financial ruin. Sabry has dealt very capably with these developments, assessing with impartiality the motives of the English and French principals in the story. Very properly he emphasizes the fact that at the very foundation of the pyramid of Egyptian abuses lay the capitulatory regime, by means of which Egypt was reduced to servility years before the British occupation of the country.

The attempts of Ismail to mitigate the effects of these outworn Ottoman concessions by instituting the Mixed Tribunals are well treated in this work. Another accomplishment contributing to a revised estimate of the maligned khedive is his pushing of the Egyptian empire deep into Africa, where it collided with British, French, and Italian interests. Sabry states that Great Britain preferred Egyptian sovereignty to that of France or Italy in the

northern Sudan, but under pretence of supporting the claims of Zanzibar would not tolerate it further south. At this point the intimation is subtly introduced that the deposition of Ismail may not have been due so much to his incapacity as a ruler as to his real ability and shrewdness in counteracting British imperialistic designs. "With his absolutism and his faults, Ismail was not a bad sovereign", Sabry concludes.

The reign of Ismail is treated topically rather than chronologically, an arrangement which, without cross references or frequent use of dates, sometimes breeds confusion. A more serious defect in a book of this type is Sabry's proclivity for adducing important evidence with only vague indications or no indication at all of informational source. However, the book is written judiciously, and generally with admirable objectivity, although there are a few statements which suggest that, in the return swing of the pendulum, Ismail may have been treated a trifle overgenerously. The book contains new and interesting points of view, in any event, and throws much useful light on an important phase of European enterprise in Africa.

Tufts College. HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

British Opium Policy in China and India. By DAVID EDWARD OWEN, Assistant Professor of History in Yale University. [Yale Historical Publications Studies.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1934. Pp. ix, 399. $4.00.)

IN a bibliographical note at the end of this book the author says, "The most authoritative account of Anglo-Chinese relations is, of course, H. B. Morse, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire, 1834–1911,* 3 vols. (New York, 1910–1918). Some aspects of British opium policy have been treated definitively, particularly periods in which the drug trade was a diplomatic issue of major importance. What is lacking, from the point of view of this study, is a discussion of the Indian phase and of the decades in which the opium trade had little influence upon British policy in China" (p. 368). Believing that "an appreciation of the opium system in India is essential to an understanding of the situation as it developed in China" (preface, p. viii), Professor Owen has undertaken to make a study of the Indo-British opium trade to China from its beginnings in the eighteenth century down to its end in the second decade of the twentieth century. The first chapter in the book is an introductory sketch of the history of opium from its first appearance in the annals of medical science, in the works of physicians of ancient Greece, down through the transmission of the knowledge and use of the drug to the East by the Arabs and the capture and exploitation of the opium trade by Europeans. It also gives the history of opium in China down to the eighteenth century, when the emperor began issuing edicts against the practice of smoking it. This is followed by the eleven chapters of the study proper, which discuss the estab-

lishment of the opium monopoly in Bengal, the early opium trade at Canton, the monopoly under the East India Company, the trade at the outer anchorages, the crisis of 1839, the opium question in China from 1840 to 1856, legalization of the importation of opium into China in 1858, opium and treaty revision, the Indian opium system under the crown, the anti-opium movement and the Royal Commission, and the ending of the trade. It is in his treatment of the two phases of the question the discussion of which he found wanting in Morse's work that the author has made his greatest contribution. As a whole it is a thorough and much needed study.

Since it is a study of British opium policy, it may not be a valid criticism to point out that the treatment of Chinese policy in regard to the opium trade is unsatisfactory. One can but wish, however, that the interpretation of Chinese policy had been based on sources other than the testimony of British opium merchants, or, at best, on translations of Chinese documents made by members of the Canton English-speaking community; who, one and all, whatever their position with respect to the opium trade might be, were struggling to free themselves of the restraints put upon them by the Chinese. In agreeing with the author that an appreciation of the opium system in India is essential to an understanding of the situation as it developed in China, we must add that so, also, is an appreciation of Chinese policy—an appreciation which can only be based on the study of Chinese sources.

In his preface the author says (pp. viii-ix): "In the interest of simplicity but at the sacrifice of strict accuracy, I have ventured to omit diacritical marks and the hyphen in rendering the names of Chinese individuals. Thus T'ang Shao-yi is written Tang Shao Yi". There are also some inaccuracies in the rendering of Chinese names which are not due to the omission of diacritical marks or the hyphen (as, for example, Tang for Têng T'ing-chên, p. 138). It would seem that the lack of precision in the matter of Chinese names in texts in which the Chinese characters are not given, inevitable because of the limitations of romanization, makes difficulties enough without deliberate departure from the rules generally accepted and followed by sinologists.

Cornell University. GUSSIE ESTHER GASKILL.

Die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858–1871. Band VIII, *August 1866 bis Mai 1867.* Bearbeitet von Dr. HERBERT MICHAELIS. [Diplomatische Aktenstücke, herausgegeben von der Historischen Reichskommission unter Leitung von Erich Brandenburg, Otto Hoetzsch, Hermann Oncken.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1934. Pp. 840.)

THIS volume, the fourth to appear in print, begins the third series into which the work is divided and covers the period from August 23, 1866, to May 11, 1867. Dr. Michaelis has maintained the high standard of editorial

technique shown in the preceding volumes (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIX, 521–523). In choice of materials, however, he has been more limited than his colleagues. He was refused permission to examine the documents in the Russian archives which provided so important an addition to the preceding series. The editors hope to overcome this difficulty and to include the Russian materials in a supplementary volume. In addition, in view of the promised but long delayed Italian publication, no documents from the Italian archives have been printed even in summary. On the other hand, in order to carry out his purpose of presenting a continuous and well-rounded picture of Prussian foreign policy, the editor has included the necessary documents, regardless of whether or not they are easily accessible in other collections.

The volume contains 624 principal documents and some 381 others in summary or extract in the footnotes. At least 192 of the principal documents have been printed elsewhere: Bismarck's instructions in Volume VI of *Die gesammelten Werke*, Goltz's reports from Paris on the Franco-Prussian alliance and the Luxemburg questions in Hermann Oncken, *Die Rheinpolitik Kaiser Napoleons III*, etc. Yet none of the important French documents, not even Benedetti's reports from Berlin, are reprinted; references are given to *Les origines diplomatiques de la guerre de 1870–1871*. As far as possible all documents have been reproduced from the original manuscripts and in many cases marginal notes and textual emendations have been more fully shown than in either Oncken's or Thimme's volumes.

The decisive victory of the Prussians at Königgrätz and the reorganization of the German Confederation upset the balance of power and the next five years are marked by the efforts of the powers to meet the new situation. France was especially disturbed by the sudden rise of a growing military state on her eastern frontier and the most important subject in the volume before us is the attempt of France to secure compensation, in co-operation with Prussia. So much of the material on this subject has been published elsewhere that for the most part the new evidence simply fills in details. The correspondence of the Prussian foreign office with the legation at The Hague and the reports of the Dutch minister at Berlin add a little to our knowledge of the way in which Bismarck was preparing the way for the French purchase of Luxemburg. There is additional evidence of the dangerous effects of military preparations on pending negotiations at the height of the crisis in the spring of 1867 and Bismarck's complaints to Loftus of French military measures foreshadow those of the middle of July, 1870. At the same time, Benedetti, whose suspicions of Prussian policy had already been aroused by the rejection of the first French demands for compensation (no. 180), made no secret to the Austrian representative at Berlin of his desire for revenge for the failure in Luxemburg. He was, he said, "très chauvin" and expressed his confidence that France alone could beat Prussia. If Austria

should mobilize in Bohemia, the Prussians would be lost. It would be well to deal with Prussia while the South German armies were still disorganized. He hoped that the day would come when he could disclose the "procédés inouïs" to which he had been subjected (no. 456). A fortnight later, he was again urging a preventive war (no. 519). A suggestion for further research is offered by Bismarck's statement to the British ambassador that "on a former occasion America had offered to Prussia the assistance of a fleet" (no. 544). There is also more information about Napoleon's naïve attempt in the fall of 1866 to persuade Prussia to join with France in a guarantee of the Papal States (no. 101 and *passim*). Perhaps the most significant new document is no. 3, Manteuffel's telegram of August 24, 1866, from Russia: "Sondiert. Fürst Gortschakow ist auf nichts Positives eingegangen, aber Ew. Exzellenz können fest gegen Frankreich auftreten. . . ."

In the absence of documents from the Russian and Italian archives, Bismarck's conversations with foreign diplomats, which must always be used to check his own dispatches, are most richly represented in the reports of the Austrian envoy to Berlin. The restoration of diplomatic relations between Austria and Prussia began with a slight *malentendu* when Baron Brenner was instructed to express Franz Joseph's personal interest in leniency to Saxony. "Was ich von fürstlicher Würde, von monarchischen Prinzipien sprach", Baron Brenner reported, "wies er mit dem ihm eigenen Zynismus zurück. 'Hätte Oesterreich', sagte er, 'seit Jahrhunderten die Politik verfolgt wie wir, es stünde heute an unserer Stelle, wir wären verschwunden. Was die deutschen Dynastien sind, sie haben es dem Reiche abgerungen . . . es ist endlich Zeit, dass die deutsche Nation, so mächtig und zahlreich, aufhöre bloss ein Objekt der europäischen Politik zu sein; sie muss mitzählen und ihr Gewicht in die Wagschale legen; nur Preussen kann ihr dazu helfen, indem es die Gunst des Augenblicks benutzt' " (August 29, 1866). As the Luxemburg crisis developed, however, Bismarck began to reiterate his familiar arguments for Austro-Prussian co-operation, with its natural basis in the origins of the Imperial House, the history, traditions, and German nationality of a large part of the population, and the German culture of the Austrian monarchy—provided, of course, "dass Oesterreich nicht in meinem Reviere jage" (no. 117 and *passim*). Bismarck's efforts, which were received with a certain skeptical reserve by both Wimpffen and Beust, were seconded by the Bavarian government. The evidence on the mission of Count Taufkirchen to Berlin and Vienna is more complete than in the earlier accounts.

With the dissolution of the German Confederation, the relations of the South German states with both Austria and Prussia become definitely "international politics" and so, subjects for inclusion in this work. There is material here on the South German Confederation, which does not seem to

have been taken very seriously, on the reorganization of the South German military forces, and on the *casus foederis* of the offensive and defensive alliance treaties of Prussia with the South German states.

The enumeration of the principal themes of the volume does not in any way exhaust its interest for the specialist in the period. In the new material presented are interesting comments by King William on the pending negotiations, discussions of the Eastern Question, complaints of Harry Arnim's over-zealous activity at Rome, premature hints of an impending French-Austrian-Italian *rapprochement*, and other details which fill out the history and throw light on the personalities of the times.

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

Quellen zur deutschen Politik Österreichs, 1859–1866. Unter Mitwirkung von OSKAR SCHMID, herausgegeben von HEINRICH RITTER VON SRBIK. Band I, *Juli 1859 bis November 1861.* [Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. Jahrhunderts.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1934. Pp. xxi, 811. 38.40 M.)

THE biographer of Metternich, Professor Heinrich Ritter von Srbik, is now extending his field of research to the two decades after the political demise of his hero. To prepare the way for a history of Austria in the years before Königgrätz, and to provide a counterpart to the German documentary publication, *Die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858–1871*, Professor Srbik is presenting the first of some five volumes of sources for Austria's German policy between 1859 and 1866. In this arduous task he is ably assisted by Dr. Oskar Schmid of the Vienna Staatsarchiv. The editor's intention is to let the documents speak for themselves, reserving his own interpretation for his later history. As in the German publication, no *Tendenz* is shown in the selection of documents or in the footnotes. Besides the rich treasures of the Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, the editor has tapped the Vienna Kriegsarchiv and the private archives of the four most influential official advisers of Franz Joseph on foreign affairs, his ministers Rechberg, Mensdorff, and Esterhazy, and his counselor for German affairs, Biegeleben. No private Hapsburg documents will apparently see the light in this collection, nor will the Schmerling and Crenneville papers; but the emperor's political views as expressed to the Prussian, Saxon, and Bavarian envoys are given in borrowings from the Berlin, Dresden, and Munich archives. The freshness of the material in the first volume may be appreciated from the fact that out of the 546 documents, only nine have apparently been published before.

Lack of funds has enforced severe limitation both of references to previous publications and of topics treated. Within these limitations the editors have wrought remarkably well. The printing of entire documents rather than excerpts or résumés is commendable. If Austria's relations to non-German

powers appear only incidentally, if the Hessian constitutional struggle, the Schleswig-Holstein negotiations before 1863, the legislative work of the Confederation, and Austria's rivalry with the *Zollverein* have been intentionally slighted, the more important problems of the military reorganization of the German *Bund* and federal reform, the growing national movement, the negotiations between Austria and Prussia for an alliance pact, and Austria's position between ambitious Prussia and the frightened sovereigns of the lesser states may be studied in great detail. The printing is admirably accurate and readable, but the reviewer questions the efficacy of classifying twenty-eight important documents merely as annexes to others, and excluding them from the index.

This first volume opens with an exchange of letters between the Prince Regent William of Prussia and Franz Joseph shortly after Villafranca, and ends in November, 1861, with the Austrian reply to Beust's plan for the remodeling of the Confederation. The sources reflect the disillusionment in Germany at the lack of unity shown in the struggle of 1859 against the Latins. The *Nationalverein* loomed like a specter frightening the governments into action to modernize the creaking machinery of the Confederation. The phoenix of a uniting Italy was driving Franz Joseph to seek a hard and fast alliance with Prussia by negotiations in Berlin and conversations with the prince regent in Teplitz. The new documents sustain Hengelmüller's and Stern's account of these parleys, and add many important facts. Until the parallel volume of the Prussian documents has appeared, however, a complete picture cannot be attempted. Nonetheless it is now evident that, after rejecting the Prussian draft of a treaty in April, 1861, the Austrians did not close the door to further negotiations (no. 403), though none of the Austrian ministers saw how they could be profitably continued (no. 400). William had loyally, but perhaps unwisely, given Franz Joseph at Teplitz a general (and written) promise of aid against France (no. 237). With this in their pocket the Austrians preferred to await more favorable circumstances, after April, 1861, before pressing further toward a treaty. But conditions grew worse with Schleinitz's fall and the advent of Bernstorff. Like an anticipation of Bismarck sounds the warning of Manteuffel in August, 1861: "Mark this well, if we don't come to an understanding, either we will be marching to Prague or you will be marching to Berlin" (no. 478).

As to the policies of different individuals, these sources show that Franz Joseph from December, 1859, consistently favored friendliness in form toward Prussia; and that the attitudes and policies of Rechberg and Biegeleben were surprisingly alike. There is scarcely a trace of the bitterly anti-Prussian Biegeleben of 1864–1866. The most interesting single document is his memorandum for the emperor's conversations at Teplitz (no. 234), containing as it does the chief revelation of a volume full of intriguing novelties for the

historian of the Germanies: Biegeleben's suggestion, if necessary "in view of the importance of the moment", to make concessions on Hapsburg primacy in the Diet. Franz Joseph did not make the concession, and the favorable moment never returned. The ultimate result was Königgrätz.

Princeton. CHESTER W. CLARK.

A History of the Great War, 1914–1918. By C. R. M. F. CRUTTWELL, Principal of Hertford College, Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xii, 649. $5.50.)

A History of the World War, 1914–1918. By LIDDELL HART. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1935. Pp. 635. $4.00.)

MR. Cruttwell's book marks, perhaps, a turn in the tide of war history in England—a change which is brought out more sharply by the publication of the Lloyd George memoirs and the reappearance of Captain Liddell Hart's volume. These two together bring to a climax the type of vindictively factional history which has held the field hitherto in England, the type which has built itself up around the thesis of an inherent and irrepressible conflict between 'soldiers' and 'politicians'. The whole field of the Great War is pressed flat into this simple formula; and the general body of participants is stamped into the mold of one or the other category. By this simple classification Joffre, Haig, and Falkenhayn form a single military bloc with such types as Henry Wilson, Conrad, and Sir John Fisher; while Asquith and Balfour stand shoulder to shoulder with Malvy and Erzberger. England passed through her previous wars without succumbing to any such intellectual complex, but 1914 had more far-reaching consequences; and these synthetic figures of politician and soldier have taken their place once for all in the well-filled gallery of historical waxworks.

It is to be noted that this historical formula is a purely English phenomenon. In America the questions involved in our participation have not been approached along these lines. In France and Germany so artificial an alignment could hardly take form, and the efforts to exploit it for party purposes collapsed under the general frankness of postwar controversy. Other countries maintained successfully throughout the war the supremacy of the civil over the military power; and nowhere else has it been assumed that this must imply chaos and disorder. But in England the historical discussion has taken form around the effort to rehabilitate the political fortunes of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill. The messes and bungles which *occasionally* marked the conduct of the war by the British cabinet have been twisted into questions of political principle—just as Wilson's difficulties over boundaries at Paris were later transposed into moral emotions. All sense of proportion and perspective has been lost, and the whole range of the war has shriveled

into an intensely insular phenomenon—a thing taking place inside Downing Street and the lobbies of the House of Commons, and turning endlessly around the dialectical fiction of a struggle of statesmen against generals and admirals. The vast population which fought out the real war is employed again as mere cannon fodder for this English political wrangle; while the rest of us, the general readers of history throughout the world at large, are invited to fall into step behind Lloyd George as the intellectual leader of the 'civilians'.

Captain Liddell Hart is the acknowledged Trumpet-Major of the forces aligned against "Military Stupidity", and his active support is one of the main factors in the success they enjoy at present. The blurb terms him very properly 'the only permanent military critic in Europe'. His critical attitude is not only permanent but universal, and with a loftiness of view unparalleled in military historians he condemns as incompetent a whole generation of soldiers: all the armies of the day, from America to Russia, are gathered impartially into a single major excommunication.

> The Staff-trained leaders of 1914 . . . had been brought up on a diet of theory, supplemented by scraps of history cooked to suit the prevailing taste: not on the experience contained in real history. For this to be attainable a critical mind is the first requirement; but such a faculty was frowned on by the military tradition of the nineteenth century . . . .

The arrangement of facts and rhetoric necessary to develop this thesis was 'cooked to suit the prevailing taste' in *The Real War* (1925). It is reprinted in the present volume under a new title, with about 100 pages of new matter. Most of this is not worked into the old text but added separately, with a curious disorder of double narratives. After reaching the armistice we begin over again, with different versions of various events of 1918. There are also two separate accounts of the Marne, the second of which advances the idea that Winston Churchill was in no small degree responsible for the victory of the Marne. This is the *reductio ad absurdum* of sycophant history.

In spirit and aim and in general intellectual quality, Mr. Cruttwell's volume offers a welcome contrast. He rather accepts the politician *vs.* soldier notion, and is thoroughly friendly toward Lloyd George. This same spirit, however, appears in his attitude to others; and his effort is not to score off an unlucky general but to understand what happened and to appraise characters and motives fairly. The fairness is not an effort but an instinctive quality of mind; and even in coming upon serious errors a reader is won over, so to speak, by the candor and the honestly judicial quality of statement. In a field torn by vindictive wrangles the book is a masterpiece of uncontroversial writing. It is free from rhetoric; there is no philosophizing nonsense over principles of war; no exhibition of a personal attitude; and by and large the book is free from national bias or distortion—even the Italian army is dealt

with fairly. The opening plans of campaign are badly handled; and there are errors which are unnecessary in 1934; one or two are comical. We read that Plan XVII "appears to have been partly inspired by the philosophy of Bergson, then so popular in France"; also a poignant tale of the Americans in the Argonne: "It is said that 700 men were starved to death in the front-line trenches." The Angels of Mons no doubt provided for these, and such stuff is wholly out of place in Mr. Cruttwell's book. This civilian, whose war service was far longer than that of Moltke or Schlieffen, deals with the actual work of the war with a thoroughly professional sense of physical realities. His soldiers, and even his generals, are workaday men rather than projections of fanciful ideas; and the bewildering detail of war is treated with admirable clarity and sense of proportion. All in all it is by far the best short history of the war in English.

Cambridge. T. H. THOMAS.

India, Minto, and Morley, 1905–1910. Compiled from the correspondence between the Viceroy and the Secretary of State by MARY, COUNTESS OF MINTO. With extracts from her Indian journal. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. viii, 447. $7.50.)

Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform, Session 1933–1934. Volume I, part I, *Report;* part II, *Proceedings.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1934. Pp. xxii, 427; x, 655. 1*s.*; 1*s.* 6*d.*)

THE sources for the history of constitutional reform in India may be divided into those that emphasize personalities and those that are primarily concerned with technical details. The Countess of Minto's book belongs in the first category, along with Lord Morley's *Recollections* (1917) and Mr. Montagu's *Indian Diary* (1930). The other class is composed mainly of government publications, such as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report (1918), the Simon Report (1930), the White Papers of 1931 and 1933, and the Report and Proceedings of the Joint Committee of Parliament (1934).

The account of the Morley-Minto regime given by Lord Morley in the second volume of his *Recollections* is based on his own letters; Mr. John Buchan presented the other side of the medal in his *Life of Lord Minto,* which was published in 1924; Lady Minto, using her journal and the correspondence on both sides, sketches a better balanced picture. She revives and amplifies Mr. Buchan's argument that Minto was the architect of the Reforms and shows how skillfully he carried on the epistolary conflict with his egocentric chief in London. She does not, however, fully appreciate the difficulties of Morley's position as a member of a Liberal government and a lifelong critic of British autocracy in Ireland. He could wage the battle for

reform with genuine enthusiasm, but it was not so easy to approve and defend the drastic measures urged by the governor general for the suppression of political agitation. It is now generally admitted that Minto was right and that the sword and olive branch policy helped to save India during the War, but it is hard not to sympathize with Morley's qualms about summary trials and deportations. Lady Minto is very modest about her share in her husband's success, although the description of social activities at the viceregal court shows that it was by no means negligible. Through her courteous and considerate treatment of the Amir Habibullah of Afghanistan, when he visited Calcutta in 1907, she won for the British Empire a friend whose loyalty was invaluable during the years from 1914 to 1918. There are a few indiscretions. She is severe on Lord Curzon, but his boorish behavior toward her and her husband when they first arrived in India was inexcusable. Lord Kitchener is more highly favored, although, even in his case, there is possibly too much said about his disappointment when he was not chosen as Minto's successor. It is not very discreet even now to harp on the boredom of Habibullah's prolonged visit or to quote the Aga Khan as saying in 1910 that he had "instructed the priests in every mosque to issue a decree that any Mohammedans who incite to rebellion, or go about preaching sedition, will be eternally damned". But these are minor defects. *India, Minto, and Morley, 1905–1910,* is excellent reading and it throws new light on one of the most important periods in the history of modern India.

In December, 1931, Parliament approved the Indian policy of His Majesty's government and authorized them to continue the work of collecting material for the new Constitution. A White Paper, entitled *Proposals for Indian Constitutional Reform,* was published in March, 1933, and shortly afterward a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament was set up, with Lord Linlithgow as chairman, to consider these proposals, in consultation with Indian representatives, and report to Parliament. A few interim volumes of evidence and records appeared in 1933–1934 and the final *Report* and *Proceedings* were published on November 21, 1934. It is impossible to do justice to the *Report* within the limits of this review, that is, to summarize the contents of a document which is itself a marvel of condensation. There is to be established in India "a responsibly governed Federation of States and Provinces, on the understanding that the responsible Government so established must, during a period of transition, be qualified by limitations in certain directions". These limitations are designed to prevent the government from degenerating into anarchy, to protect racial and religious minorities, and to safeguard British financial and commercial interests. They are strongly emphasized in the report in order to undermine the conservative opposition in Great Britain, without much regard apparently for unfavorable repercussions in India. Federation, provincial autonomy, the army, the public serv-

ices, and other problems are discussed in considerable detail and there is a special section on Burma, which at long last is to be separated from India and given a government of its own. This report is the basis of the new Government of India Bill recently piloted through the House of Commons by Sir Samuel Hoare.

Bryn Mawr College. WILLIAM ROY SMITH.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Founding of Harvard College. By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON, Class of 1908. [The Tercentennial History of Harvard College and University, 1636–1936.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1935. Pp. xxvi, 472. $5.00.)

PROFESSOR Morison's book is the first of four volumes to appear in connection with the Harvard University Tercentenary. It carries the story of the college to about 1650; the second, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century,* will continue it to 1708; the third will be *Harvard in the Eighteenth Century;* and the fourth will bring the history to the beginning of President Eliot's administration. As Professor Morison published in 1930 *The Development of Harvard University, 1869–1929,* the five volumes together will give a consecutive history of our oldest university from its foundation in 1636 until near the close of President Lowell's administration. If the remaining volumes continue the high standard already set Harvard will have a history which for combination of accurate scholarship, importance of subject matter, interpretation of relationship to general cultural development, and literary distinction, cannot be excelled by that of any other university, European or American. Perhaps Mullinger's *The University of Cambridge* is the most like it, although hardly its equal in literary charm. The epoch-making works of Denifle and Rashdall remain the foundations of our knowledge of the origin and early development of universities in Europe, but for the universities of the United States, and their European connection, these new volumes are likely to take an equally high place, although necessarily more restricted in scope.

The first part of the volume under review treats of the European background of the American university; the second describes the origin and first fifteen years of Harvard College. Of the several appendixes, the most important is Appendix B containing the most complete list yet published of English university men who migrated to New England before 1646, "of which 100 are Cantabrigians and 32 Oxonians—three being connected with both universities" (p. 359). There were about 3680 families of European stock in New England in 1640, making one university man to every 32 families, a very high proportion (p. 361). Appendix D reproduces in facsimile *New*

Englands First Fruits, valuable because of its contemporary information about the early days of Harvard, and because the only complete reprint of the excessively rare original, that by Sabin in 1865, is itself rare.

The early chapters regarding European background, based chiefly on Rashdall for the medieval period, supplemented by D'Irsay and others for later periods, trace the growth of universities from the guild movement, and show that the Arts course, even in the thirteenth century, was much better fitted to the needs of the time than most writers today realize, as it provided "a *liberal* education—the education of a free man"—through placing the student "in touch with some of the greatest minds of antiquity" (p. 33). In this section, which shows in a most interesting way that American academic practices were largely of European origin (see especially pp. 25–34), the only criticisms I would make are that the significance of the "nation" and other self-governing academic groups as a training for democracy is not adequately brought out, and that the contribution of Padua, especially to the development of science, should receive more attention.

Except through the English universities, especially Cambridge, Professor Morison finds only slight traces of direct European influence on Harvard. Trinity College, Dublin, has certain significant points of similarity especially in its four "classes" and its degree-giving power, though the "institutional resemblance between Trinity and Harvard seems evidence of a sisterly rather than a filial relation" (p. 125). There is no direct evidence of Scotch influence on Harvard other than in some matters connected with commencement exercises, but the curriculum at Aberdeen and Edinburgh was very similar to that on the Charles in the first half of the seventeenth century. As to Dutch universities, the first head of Harvard, Nathaniel Eaton, was an alumnus of Franeker, and William Ames, professor of theology there, greatly influenced New England theology through his writings. Harvard seems also to have secured from Franeker its motto, *Christo et Ecclesiae* (p. 142). Professor Morison does not find any direct influence of Dutch universities on the Harvard system of government—"institutional resemblances are wholly wanting" (p. 140)—but it has seemed to me that the system of *Curatores* appointed by the government, which played so important a part in making Leiden a great university, may have been partly responsible for the boards of trustees in most of our American universities.

A study of the leading Oxford and Cambridge colleges reveals "our debt to a class of men who more than any other gave New England her distinctive stamp and character . . . these clerical alumni of Oxford and Cambridge" who sacrificed much "for a world emphatically new, to which they felt summoned by the voice of God" (p. 120). Cambridge was the more active of the two English universities in the seventeenth century, except in science (p. 42, n. 1), but Puritan convictions so potent at Emmanuel influenced us mainly as educational ideals—"a learned clergy, and a lettered people" (p.

45). Hence Professor Morison concludes that "If we would know upon what model Harvard College was established, what were the ideals of her founders and the purposes of her first Governors, we need seek no further than the University of Cambridge" (p. 40). The author brings out in an illuminating way the importance to American education of Harvard's founding a century after Cambridge had discarded much of medievalism, and combined the ideals of Protestantism, classical scholarship, and a gentleman's education (p. 53, *cf.* pp. 56, 57).

Emmanuel College, opened in 1584, influenced Harvard most of all, because of the number of its graduates who migrated to New England—36 up to about 1640 (p. 362). These included John Cotton, Thomas Shepard, John Harvard, and the leader of the Hartford Colony, Thomas Hooker (pp. 92, 93). Laurence Chaderton, fellow of Christ's and the first master of Emmanuel, trained many of the leaders of New England, and combined, "as no other man in the puritan movement, sound scholarship, a gift for popular preaching, and a vigorous personality" together with "a taste for manly sports" (p. 95). Professor Morison deserves our thanks for unearthing a manuscript by one of Chaderton's successors in the mastership, who taught at Cambridge from 1613 to 1649, which clearly reveals the curriculum of the time. It is called "Directions for a Student in the Universitie" (pp. 62–78), and shows "the entire absence of even the most elementary mathematical or scientific studies, other than the Aristotelian Physics" (p. 76). Harvard was founded at a period "when colleges had absorbed the better part of English university life" (p. 36), consequently it was the colleges rather than the university which the founders of Harvard kept in mind when they framed its early statutes.

Professor Morison writes of the early history of Harvard with pride in the establishment of an institution of higher learning "at a place which had been a wilderness eight years before, in a colony whose history was less than ten years old, and by a community of less than ten thousand people". "No similar achievement can be found in the history of modern colonization" (p. 148). The main purpose of the early migration from England to Massachusetts Bay was religious in a broad sense, with ideals of church and state as "parallel aspects of the same divine sovereignty" (p. 154). The author shows throughout that he has no sympathy with modern historians who attribute the founding of New England mainly to economic causes. The people realized that education was vital to their ideals, and "by 1671 all New England excepting Rhode Island was under a system of compulsory education" (p. 158). But schools were not enough if, in the oft-quoted words of *New Englands First Fruits,* they were to "advance *Learning* and perpetuate it to Posterity" (p. 160).

The Salem town records of May 2, 1636, give the first reference to the "building of a Colledge" (p. 162), and at a session of the General Court in

Boston, October 28, 1636, "The Court agreed to give 400 l. towards a schoale or colledge . . ." (p. 168). This is officially recognized as the foundation act of Harvard College. Two other votes of the Court are of vital importance:

> On November 15, 1637, "The colledg is ordered to bee at Newetowne".
> On May 2, 1638, it is "Ordered, that Newetowne shall henceforward be called Cambrige" (p. 179).

Various factors led to the selection of the Cambridge site. With traditions of Oxford and Cambridge behind them, the founders naturally thought of some lowland near a river. Then too, it was the place where Thomas Shepard, an influential young graduate of Emmanuel College, was minister (p. 182). Another reason was that it had not been contaminated by the Hutchinsonian troubles of Boston. It was also fairly central for the colony; far enough from the seacoast to be free from attack; had been the seat of the General Court for a couple of years; and was a town with good houses, some of which had been abandoned by Thomas Hooker's migration to Hartford (p. 188). It is interesting to know that at that time the forest came down from the north to the neighborhood of the present Museum and Law School (p. 189), and that the principal business was in cattle, the Common being what is left of the original grazing land, and the word "yard"—which in most other American colleges is the "campus"—being merely the ordinary English word for an enclosure for domestic animals, the original college lots being part of the old Cowyard Row (p. 229), and completing what Professor Morison delightfully refers to as a "bovine atmosphere" (p. 204).

The two men connected with Harvard's early years, to whom it owes most, are John Harvard and Henry Dunster. John Harvard, a well-to-do member of London's great middle class, was a Master of Arts of Emmanuel College in 1635, married Ann Sadler a year after his graduation, and came to New England in 1637 "to enjoy 'Christ's ordinances' in their purity" (p. 214). He was 'admitted a Townsman' in Charlestown (p. 216), and worked with his fellow townsmen on a draft of laws for the colony. He also "probably performed the duties of a teaching elder, but he was never formally ordained to that office" (p. 218). He died of consumption in 1638, when thirty years old. According to *New Englands First Fruits,* he was "a godly gentleman and a lover of Learning", who left "halfe of his Estate (it being in all about 1700 l.) towards the erecting of a Colledge: and all his Library" (p. 432). The library included more than 400 volumes, about three quarters of them theological works but not exclusively of a Protestant cast. Chrysostom, Augustine, and Aquinas were there; also books showing the influence of the Renaissance, such as North's *Plutarch,* Chapman's *Homer,* Bacon's *Advancement of Learning,* and the works of Lorenzo Valla, Poliziano, Erasmus, Ramus, Alciati, etc. (pp. 264–266).

The following March (1638–1639) the General Court "Ordered, that the colledge agreed upon formerly to bee built at Cambridg shalbee called

Harvard Colledge" (p. 221). So John Harvard for a generous gift won lasting immortality, much as Elihu Yale—perhaps a more forceful but certainly a less appealing figure—did about eighty years later for a similar gift—a collection of books, and goods which when sold netted £562.12 (Dexter, *Yale Biographies and Annals,* I, 177).

The first Overseers, appointed in 1637 by the General Court, "established the College" (p. 192). Six of them were magistrates and six clergymen; seven were alumni of Cambridge, one a graduate of Oxford, and the other four were brothers or fathers of Cambridge alumni (p. 194). They conducted the college through its first commencement (1642), when they were reorganized with quasi-corporate powers as a definite board made up of the governor and deputy-governor, the president of the college, the magistrates or assistants of the colony, and the "teaching Elders" of the six leading towns (p. 326). This board remained the sole governing body until the Charter of 1650, from which time it has shared responsibility with the Corporation of President and Fellows (p. 194), and was not substantially changed until 1851 (p. 327).

After a troublesome year under the incompetent Eaton (he was fortunately never given the title of president), Harvard's constructive development was taken in hand by its first "President", Henry Dunster, a Master of Arts of Cambridge (Magdalene College), and a man of the soundest character. He guided it with a firm hand, gave it a fresh foundation, and contributed more to its progress than any president up to Dr. Eliot (p. 4). Dr. Morison believes that as in some Cambridge colleges the title "President" was inferior to that of "Master", the Overseers expected to choose for the latter position Comenius or some other eminent scholar, making him "head", but fortunately this was not done and the chief executive of Harvard and most other American universities has ever since been the president (pp. 243–246).

Dunster "found Harvard College deserted by students, devoid of buildings, wanting income or endowment, and unprovided with government or statutes. He left it a flourishing university college of the arts, provided with several buildings and a settled though insufficient income, governed under the Charter of 1650 by a body of fellows and officers whose duties were regulated by statute" (p. 246). Of special importance for American higher education was the fact that "a collegiate way of living" was now established with the completion of "Harvard College" about 1644, with open court, "hall"—the center of student life, kitchen, buttery, studies, bedrooms, etc. (see interesting plans, opposite pp. 277 and 284).

About 1646 the laws of the college were sufficiently codified to be read aloud in the College Hall. They were based mainly on the Elizabethan statutes at Cambridge, with some Puritan modifications (p. 337). They were remarkable in that they left quite vague the subjects of study, and that, in keeping with the simple Act of 1642, no religious test or oath was imposed,

thus laying invaluable foundations for American education. This breadth was maintained in the charter of 1650. Mr. Morison is of opinion that the founders knew from their English experience "that oaths were powerless to bind conscience" and had enough common sense to omit them (p. 340). The charter shows the broad purposes developed under Dunster:

> The aduancement of all good literature, artes and Sciences.
> The aduancement and education of youth in all manner of good literature Artes and Sciences.
> All other necessary provisions that may conduce to the education of the English and Indian youth of this Country in knowledge: and godliness (p. 248).

This indicates not only an interest in education but also in productive scholarship. That the founders' purpose was, however, not merely secular is evidenced by the fact that "The first college laws declared that every student was to be plainly instructed that the 'maine end of his life and studies' was *'to know God and Iesus Christ* . . . and therefore to lay *Christ* in the bottome, as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and Learning' "—an ideal which dominated Harvard College at least until the American Revolution (p. 251).

The principal sources of income were the revenues from the Boston-Charlestown Ferry, devoted to the college by the General Court in 1640 (p. 299), a few rents, and "the College Corn" ingathered after the request of the commissioners of the United Colonies in 1644 that every family in New England "which is able and willing" should give annually to the College a fourth part of a bushel of corn (*i.e.*, wheat) or its equivalent (p. 315; see n. 3). It is noteworthy that from 1645 to 1653 the two communities which contributed most, after Boston and Charlestown, were Hartford and New Haven—showing that there were already groups of people in those towns who were being prepared to support their own university later (p. 317). In 1641 the General Court sent to England three pastors who conducted "the first concerted 'drive' to obtain income and endowment for the College" (p. 303). This movement brought in some additions to the library, and a few hundred pounds, including the endowment of our first American scholarship, established by Lady Mowlson, born Anne Radcliffe (p. 307).

The remaining important acts of the Dunster administration were the beginnings of printing (where Morison follows in the main the conclusions of Green) and of Indian instruction. It is hoped that the second volume will give new information regarding the "Indian College" which Quincy in his *History of Harvard College* (I, 192) refers to as "an early systematic attempt to extend the advantages of a liberal education to the aboriginals", made "under the auspices" of the Harvard authorities. The work seems to have reached its height just after the middle of the century, for Caleb Cheeshahteaumuck, the most conspicuous product of the movement, is

credited in the Quinquennial with a B.A. degree in 1665. If, as the evidence seems to indicate, there were at one time two "colleges", in the English sense, in the university, even though the Indian one was merely the "small brick pile" referred to by Cartwright in 1665 (*cf.* Sibley, *Harvard Graduates*, vol. II, p. 202, n.), it constitutes an interesting precedent for the modern development of the House Plan.

The book is a model of the bookmaker's art—the illustrations, printing, and format being admirable. I must say, however, that I cannot adjust myself with any satisfaction to the recently developed custom of giving no capital to such words as "puritan" (p. 8), "reformation" (p. 7), and "renaissance" (p. 35), when they refer to definite and well-known historic movements.

The academic world of America is under a debt of real gratitude to Professor Morison. His book should encourage the movement, which President Conant advocated in a recent *Atlantic* article, for more study of the history of universities and of science, for it is only as we understand the past of any institution that we can develop it wisely.

Washington Cathedral. ANSON PHELPS STOKES.

The New Haven Colony. By ISABEL MACBEATH CALDER, Assistant Professor of History in Wells College. [Yale Historical Publications.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1934. Pp. vi, 301. $3.50.)

IT is almost fifty years since Charles H. Levermore's *Republic of New Haven* appeared in the Johns Hopkins series, and a new history of this Puritan colony, based on wider materials and written from a less exclusively political point of view, has long been wanted. Dr. Calder's effort is the result of patient research in both England and the Netherlands. She seems to have enjoyed every advantage known to the graduate student: inspiring teachers, helpful librarians, scholarships, a traveling fellowship. Yet the result is unsatisfying for want of historical imagination, and the power to write clear and simple English.

As one expects from a pupil of Professor Andrews, Dr. Calder has thoroughly explored the English origins of her subject, and even traced John Davenport's low-country activities in the Dutch archives. Her descriptions of the Eatons's London parish, and of the English backgrounds of other groups that made up the New Haven Colony, are a contribution in themselves. The long note (pp. 11–13) on the Feoffees of Impropriations is the best thing on that subject the reviewer has seen. As in a former contribution to the *American Historical Review* (XXXVII, 267–269), Dr. Calder shows herself competent in textual criticism of the Cotton Code. A satisfactory chapter on "The End of Christ's Kingdom" on Long Island Sound describes interesting negotiations with the Dutch for a translation of said

kingdom to the Delaware or the Raritan, and its final absorption by the less godly Connecticut.

Yet the work is singularly lifeless. Many names are mentioned, but as disembodied ghosts, without substance or personality. John Davenport by mere accumulation of facts becomes tridimensional, but numerous anecdotes and brief characterizations by Winthrop, Johnson, and Mather, which might have given life to the lesser figures, are overlooked. Miss Calder has even managed to make the adventurer John Scott seem dull and meaningless. On education in New Haven, we are given only dry husks: lists of schools, dates, and schoolmasters with their college degrees. The false starts of what later became Yale College are related; but Miss Calder is not generous to her adopted alma mater. Harvard did not secure the lion's share of the Hopkins bequest because Yale was "insignificant" (p. 144), but because Harvard was able to satisfy a Master in Chancery that "colledge" mentioned in Hopkins's will in 1657 could not mean an institution founded in 1701. A college where Samuel Johnson and Jonathan Edwards had their education cannot be dismissed as insignificant.

As regards New Haven institutions, Miss Calder has been more successful than her predecessors in disentangling town from colony, and Connecticut towns from New Haven towns. Yet we have mostly descriptions of what the officials were and how they were elected, rather than of what they did. And in a work of institutional emphasis, it is astonishing to find no reference to the famous Blue Laws. Perhaps the author felt that Mr. Prince had forever set the public right on that subject, in our *Annual Report* for 1898, pp. 97–138. But, as Percy Scholes has lately shown, in his *The Puritans and Music*, the famous "drum, trumpet, and Jew's harp" law invented by the Rev. Samuel Peters, was quoted as genuine in a standard history published as recently as 1928.

Harvard University. S. E. Morison.

The First Year of the American Revolution. By Allen French. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1934. Pp. x, 795. $6.00.)

The present volume by Mr. Allen French is a significant and substantial contribution to the history of the American Revolution. Its closely printed pages, almost eight hundred in number, crown many years of unhurried yet unremitting labor. It discloses the qualities of scholarship which gave distinction to the author's earlier books in the field; *viz.*, painstaking research, penetrating analysis of documentary material, skepticism of all assertions unsupported by contemporary testimony, and skill in the elucidation of problems of historical criticism. While the narrative is occasionally clogged by excessive detail, in general it moves smoothly along its appointed course, undergirded by lengthy footnotes and buttressed by numerous appendixes. Many of the topics treated have served as themes for successive generations

of English and American historians, yet Mr. French has managed to clothe them with fresh interest, partly by presenting new interpretations and partly by furnishing new data. In his indefatigable search for facts, he has explored numerous public and private collections both here and abroad, and has examined a mass of secondary material. The result is a book which in wealth of carefully sifted information regarding the subject is without a peer.

In his opening chapter and the appendix thereto, Mr. French flings a challenge to economic determinists. He writes: "The theory that all wars arise from economic conditions does not hold in regard to the Revolution. American resistance sprang only from political oppression" (p. 3). "I . . . feel convinced that it is wrong to ascribe an economic motive to America in fighting for what it called its freedom" (p. 718). While readily conceding that the Revolution was not caused exclusively by economic forces, one may question the view that such forces were without influence in producing the break with England. It is true, as Mr. French contends, that the public documents of the period stress mainly legal and constitutional issues, but it is also true, as he candidly confesses, that some mention is made of grievances of an economic character. It is arguable, moreover, that the political rights to which the colonists attached so much value in their state papers seemed desirable not only in order to satisfy the spirit of independence which the conditions of frontier life and a century of neglect by the mother country had bred but also in order to protect their trade and property. The question is not whether economic phenomena contributed to bring about the Revolution but how much weight is to be ascribed to such phenomena as compared with factors of a social, geographic, and political character.

In military affairs Mr. French reveals the same lively interest which is evident in his books treating the battles of Concord and Lexington and the siege of Boston. He refuses, however, to fall into the error of presenting the situation in Massachusetts in 1775–1776 mainly from the American point of view. He devotes equal attention to describing the state of affairs from the British angle. The numbers, equipment, and organization of Gage's army are the subject of many illuminating pages. Nor are naval matters neglected. A chapter on "American Beginnings on the Sea" is balanced by one on "Admiral Graves and his Difficulties", in which Mr. French directs attention to a phase of the situation quite neglected by naval historians. The battle descriptions lack the picturesqueness of Trevelyan and the dramatic power of Fortescue. Mr. French has a New England conscience about telling precisely what occurred which inhibits him from giving rein to historic imagination. This is not to imply that his descriptions are lifeless. In fact to anyone acquainted with the controversial problems involved, they are more stirring than those of less exact writers. Every engagement is seen not only as a conflict of arms but as a conflict of opinion among authorities as to

what was done or ought to have been done. Such logomachy frequently proves more engrossing than the actual battle.

Generous attention is given to civil as well as military affairs. The proceedings of Parliament and the Continental Congress are scrutinized. Statesmen and politicians are described and appraised. The transformation of sentiment in the colonies from a desire for redress of grievances into a demand for independence is traced simultaneously with the development in England of a dogged determination to suppress the revolt.

There are several useful maps and a good index. The bibliography would be improved by occasional critical comment on the sources of information.

Wellesley College. EDWARD E. CURTIS.

The Social Ideas of American Educators. By MERLE CURTI, Professor of History, Smith College. [American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Sciences, Part X.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xxii, 613, $3.00.)

As Part X of the Report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, this volume is not only illustrative of the scope of that investigation but of the emphasis which the Commission have attached to certain aspects of the task assigned them. It may be regarded as a further amplification or interpretation of what they mean by the "frame of reference". It is an attempt to trace the relation between the frame of reference of a given period and the educational leadership of that period, beginning with colonial days and continuing on to the year 1933. The author is apparently well aware of the difficulties involved in such a study and with commendable frankness has directed attention to the tentative nature of many of his results.

As a bit of intellectual history, attempting to show the origin and spread of ideas, more particularly the sensitiveness—or lack of it—of American educators to the social milieu, the author is constantly confronted with the problem of emphasis and perspective. American education is viewed essentially in the light of that emerging social order to which the Commission have directed attention in their volume of *Conclusions and Recommendations*. "A knowledge of the expectations, successes, and disappointments of the men and women who have been outstanding in the upbuilding and direction of the American schools may help to furnish incentives and warnings for those who now have at heart the social purposes of the schools in the transition to a new society" (p. xiv).

Two thirds of the book is devoted to the period since 1860 (Part II), and a considerable portion of this part is given over to developments since the nineties. The author has combined a chronological and topical treatment with a biographical emphasis. Useful as such a survey may be, many of our

well-known educators fare somewhat badly in the perspective of this new social order, in reflecting so generally the social ideas and the social outlook of their own day. The tendency to focus the reader's attention on some of the shortcomings of these educators, as measured by present day standards, makes the volume at times take on the character of a brief for the ideas of the Commission. Writing of William T. Harris, for example, the author says: "Harris likewise gave evidence of his fundamentally capitalistic bias. . . . He did not mention the influence of politics, religion, personal charm, and the 'school machines' " (pp. 332–333). Again on page 461 he queries: "Did Thorndike . . . establish facts or postulate theories which supported the characteristic social philosophy of the more well-to-do Americans?" Nonetheless many valuable and interesting data have been assembled and critically appraised, adding much to our knowledge of the activities of men like Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, William T. Harris, and others.

The author has limited his study to the elementary and secondary school and has sought to define the relation of this part of our educational system, as represented by its intellectual and spiritual leaders, to the social movements of the time, especially to those associated with business and industry. Others, however, are not neglected.

The conclusions to be reached from such a study, as the author himself indicates, can at best be only tentative until its scope has been very much widened. For one thing the rapid strides made by the public school, even within the memory of those of the present generation, make such an attempt at a perspective upon the present situation exceedingly difficult, and this is especially true in the realm of ideas. For example exception might well be taken by those who have been close to the situation, to the relative importance attached to the factors noted in the postwar years and the leadership recognized (ch. XVI, "Post-War Patterns"). In spite of its limitations, however, it is not only a contribution to the history of education, in making for a better understanding of the position of the modern school, but to the entire cultural and social history of America which has been so much neglected.

New York University. DANIEL C. KNOWLTON.

Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Von JOSEF STULZ. [Geschichte der führenden Völker.] (Freiburg i. B.; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company. 1934. Pp. xii, 339. $3.15.)

Der Aufstieg der Vereinigten Staaten zur Weltmacht. Von Dr. FRIEDRICH LUCKWALDT. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1935. Pp. 176.)

THE first volume is an attempt to discover the psychological and spiritual bonds which have welded the American people into a nation, as well as to present a summary overview of the main facts in United States history. The author's treatment of periods and events is necessarily brief; he paints with

bold strokes of the brush, but the result is generally accurate. The work is based on the better-known, standard works, supplemented by the personal observations of the writer during a number of years spent in this country. Errors of detail have crept in, and there are some important omissions, but in general, the writer's treatment follows the generally accepted, newer viewpoints of American scholars. The forces of sectionalism are thoroughly appreciated, and considerable material on American social, cultural, and intellectual history has been included. One fourth of the book carries the story to 1783, and the last third deals with the events of the last seventy-five years. The complicated decade of the 1850's has suffered most from overcondensation, leaving the reader in some confusion. Fourteen pages for the years from 1850 to 1864 are hardly enough. The World War, and the role of Woodrow Wilson, are discussed with commendable objectivity. As far as historical facts go, the book will give the readers for whom it was primarily intended a balanced, and generally accurate survey of the development of the United States.

It is with the author's philosophizing about these facts that many American readers will take issue, not because of an unwillingness to face unpleasant truths about our national progress, but because the writer, like most other Germans who have written on the same theme, has found explanations for the American character which are entirely too simple to be true. American "success psychology", pragmatism, materialism, venal politics, and the drive for the "almighty dollar" are not the whole story, and their evils are as well understood in the United States as elsewhere. The writer has little sympathy with the democratic process, and his picture of Thomas Jefferson is too one-sided to be fair or accurate. His judgments on higher education are superficial. The writer sounds the death knell of liberalism everywhere. Centralization, standardization, and the disappearance of the old civil liberties announce the dawning day. The United States Congress and the judiciary have been more or less *ausgeschaltet* already, perhaps to be *gleichgeschaltet* soon, leaving Mr. Roosevelt as the incarnation of the *Führer-prinzip* in the White House. Such prophetic, and perhaps wishful, thinking may be expected from a witness of the coming of the Third Reich in Germany, but it leaves the author on dangerous ground.

The second volume under review is by an author, who already has a two volume history of the United States, published in Germany fifteen years ago, to his credit. In this little book, Dr. Luckwaldt reviews rapidly, but without omitting any of the essential details, the history of American foreign policy from colonial times to the present. He makes no original contributions but provides, in small compass, an objective and generally well-balanced interpretation of American expansion, and of the role of the United States in recent world affairs. The style is clear and interesting. Although the book is intended for Germans, the American reader will find it interesting, if for no other reason than to get the cumulative effect of this description of familiar

events in American foreign policy, as seen by an intelligent and scholarly foreigner, who focused his attention entirely on that phase of American history in which the nation reveals itself to the outside world.

The Ohio State University. CARL WITTKE.

Policy of the United States toward Maritime Commerce in War. Prepared by CARLTON SAVAGE, Division of Research and Publication. Volume I, *1776–1914.* [The Department of State.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1934. Pp. xiv, 533. $1.25.)

AT a time when both the executive and legislative departments of the United States government are studying the problems of neutrality with a view to possible modification of some of our traditional policies to render less likely our enforced participation in future wars, the Division of Research and Publication of the Department of State has rendered a great service by the publication of this interesting volume. It consists in the main of one hundred and sixty-six well-chosen documents, drawn from the archives of the Navy Department and the Department of State, as well as from printed collections of American treaties and diplomatic correspondence, decisions of the Supreme Court and Court of Claims, and the British Parliamentary Papers. They touch on every aspect of the problem of neutral rights except impressment, and afford a striking record of the efforts of the United States government to safeguard and promote the lucrative trade of its citizens in time of war.

With one exception, the standards of editing in this well-printed volume are high. In republishing material which had already appeared in print, Mr. Savage has generally indicated the printed source; but he has failed to do so in the case of eleven documents fully published elsewhere and fourteen others of which substantial extracts have long been familiar to students of Moore's *Digest of International Law* and other collections of our diplomatic correspondence.

Of the new material, the most interesting is that concerning the unsuccessful attempts of John Quincy Adams in the years 1823 to 1828 as Secretary of State and President to curtail belligerent rights and abolish private war upon the sea. In this connection Mr. Savage might well have included two extracts from Adams's *Writings* (V, 140; VI, 244). Avowing himself unable "to imagine a possible state of the world for futurity in which the United States shall not be a great naval and military power", Adams pointed out that "we can scarcely imagine indeed the possibility of a war between the United States and any European power, of which the ocean would not be the principal theatre; and there is no nation upon the globe, which in contracting conventional engagements to enlarge the rights of maritime neutrality would make so great and real a sacrifice of their particular interests to the principles of general justice, and progressive civilization, as this".

The documents are preceded by an admirable historical introduction of 121 pages which will prove highly serviceable to students of American diplomatic history. As befits the official character of the publication Mr. Savage is chary of comment, but he does point out that Van Buren erred in assuming that the principles regarding neutral commerce in the treaty plan of 1776 were in accordance with the law of nations. Where so much of interest is offered it may seem ungracious to ask for more, but the work would have been still more helpful to students if the notes had included some additional references to pertinent literature, such as Lingelbach's article on "England and Neutral Trade" in the second volume of the *Military Historian and Economist;* or Malkin's masterly study of "The Inner History of the Declaration of Paris" in the *British Year Book of International Law* for 1927. It is to be hoped that the Department of State, in completing this noteworthy publication to cover the period subsequent to 1914, will remedy the most important defect of the present volume by including an index.

Harvard University. JAMES P. BAXTER, 3d.

Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld, and Sarah Grimké, 1822–1844. Edited by GILBERT H. BARNES and DWIGHT L. DUMOND. Two volumes. [The American Historical Association, The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1934. Pp. xxxvii, 510; x, 511–1023. $10.00.)

WHEN, a year ago, Professor Gilbert H. Barnes published his *Antislavery Impulse, 1830–1844* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIX, 747), setting forth a new interpretation of the abolitionist movement and a new appraisal of the chief figures therein, it was promised that the extensive manuscript material upon which his work had been chiefly based would be made available. This has now been done in the volumes under review which constitute one of the most important additions to our knowledge of the abolitionist movement that has been made in many years.

The bulk of the letters now printed in these volumes were found four years ago in an old trunk in a Massachusetts farmhouse. It was not by mere chance that they turned up, for Professor Barnes had zealously sought them over a period of years and had followed up every suggestion or hint as to their possible whereabouts. So extensive was the manuscript material from this and other sources that it was not possible to print all of it. The basis of selection was the significance of individual papers in relation to the life of Theodore Dwight Weld or to the antislavery struggle. It is safe to say that many others will garner rich returns from this body of material relating to one of the most controversial periods of American history, for in these letters and papers are revealed the thoughts, the motives, and the subtle workings of

the mind of the men and women who were engaged in what they viewed as a great moral crusade. We have an unforgettable picture of Weld himself as he stands revealed in the letters which he wrote to Angelina Grimké prior to their marriage. Here is a collection of love letters of unique character. Weld felt called upon to picture for his future bride all that he could tell of his own character, disposition, and personal habits, at such length that one suspects a certain morbid pleasure in the confession of faults. The man lives as never before after one reads such a letter, for example, as that of March 12, 1838. It is a pity that portions of this letter were not incorporated by Professor Barnes in his earlier work.

Weld, in Professor Barnes's *Antislavery Impulse* is presented as being "the movement's man of power, the greatest individual factor in its triumph". The obscurity of Weld in the printed records of the crusade is explained as being his own choice. He would accept no office, he declined invitations to conventions and anniversaries, he would not appear on the platform in the larger cities, nor would he permit his words to be published in the anti-slavery press. His attitude is well illustrated by a letter to Lewis Tappan, written in April, 1836, in which he says:

> I fear much lest our anti-slavery agents get too much in the habit of gadding, attending anniversaries, sailing round in Cleopatra barges, clustering together, six, eight, or ten of them in a place at a big meeting, staying a few days and then streaming away some hundred miles to another and another, and lingering round large cities. The great desideratum in our Cause is work, work, boneing down to it. Let the great cities alone: they must be burned down by back fires. The strings to touch in order to move them live in the country.

How little connection there was between Weld's work and that of William Lloyd Garrison is shown by the fact that there is not a single letter from Garrison in the whole collection and only one letter from Weld to him. In this letter, which is dated January 2, 1833, Weld declines Garrison's invitation to speak before the New England Anti-Slavery Society and states his complete ignorance of either the principles or the operations of the society. Garrison was one of the guests at the wedding of Weld to Angelina Grimké in 1838 but there is no further evidence of any intimacy, nor, indeed, that there was any co-operation by them in the work to which they were both devoted. The names that do appear most frequently in the correspondence, apart from the Grimkés, are Charles Stuart, the retired English officer who gained Weld's friendship as a youth and continued in close friendship, Lewis Tappan, Elizur Wright, jr., James G. Birney, and James A. Thome. The letters passing between Weld and the Grimké sisters form a considerable portion of the second volume.

Theodore Dwight Weld can no longer be an obscure figure in American history. He has been presented by Professor Barnes in his earlier volume in

a challenging role which is supported by the evidence of the volumes of letters and papers. For the care and completeness with which Professor Barnes and Professor Dumond have handled these documents students of American history will be grateful. One may expect to see these volumes frequently quoted in the future, for all who have occasion to deal with the slavery controversy will have to take this evidence into account.

The University of Western Ontario. FRED LANDON.

R. E. Lee: a Biography. By DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN. Volumes III, IV. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xiv, 559; x, 594. $7.50.)

THE two final volumes of the life of Lee, appearing in February, 1935, were greeted with as loud acclaim as the two earlier ones, which won for Dr. Freeman in May the Pulitzer Prize for biography. That so long and scholarly a work has been so well received and widely circulated is a tribute not only to the author but also to the good taste of the reading public. It is likewise a tribute to the subject. Without doubt the Confederate chieftain has been accepted by most Americans as a national hero. Without doubt, also, this biography of him is generally accepted as definitive, as it ought to be. There can be no question of the comprehensiveness, the thoroughness, and the high scholarly quality of the work. The author seems to have consulted everything and everybody. To ten pages of personal acknowledgments he attaches more than twenty-five of select critical bibliography, though he says this list contains less than half the works cited in the text. In the notes there is additional critical comment on various sources, and controversial subjects are treated in numerous appendixes. In the text itself there is a wealth of personal detail, drawn from contemporary accounts and works of reminiscence—all carefully weighed, one against another. It would be unreasonable to ask for more factual material or more illuminating comment or a better story.

Volume II ended, dramatically, with Chancellorsville and the death of Jackson, "unquestionably the turning-point in the history of the Army of Northern Virginia". Volume III begins with "might-have-beens" of that conflict, the darkest being Lee's failure to recall Longstreet before the battle, partly at least because he allowed this able but opinionated corps commander to browbeat him. Then follows a detailed account of the reorganization of the army previous to the fateful Gettysburg campaign. This is perhaps the author's most significant contribution to the understanding of that much-studied battle. He says: "Nothing happened on that field that could not be read in the roster of the army, the peculiarities and inexperience of the new leaders, the distribution of the units, and the inevitable confusion of a staff that had to be enlarged or extemporized to direct troops with which it was unacquainted" (III, 16). His summing up of the factors in the defeat, after

a full and vivid account of the fighting, is masterly. Here, as elsewhere, he criticizes the leaders more than the army. Stuart, Ewell, and especially Longstreet are blamed, and Lee's own mistakes are pointed out with utter frankness. Dr. Freeman's judgment seems as near final as may be, but one factor appears to have been inadvertently minimized. Because of his proper biographical method of viewing the scene through the eyes of Lee, he blames the Confederates for a defeat without fully crediting the Federals with a victory. To Union generalship, gunnery, and fighting qualities he might have paid a fuller tribute.

The detailed account of the retreat is almost as thrilling as that of the battle itself. In connection with the minor operations until the beginning of Grant's campaign in May, 1864, the author gives a picture of the Army of Northern Virginia, describing the nondescript uniforms, the privations of the men, and their superb morale, with unforgettable vividness. Indeed, he has memorialized not only the commander but also Lee's army. The critic can find no fault here with Lee's efforts to procure supplies; he was ever at his best when striving to overcome the insuperable. Military critics, disposed to apply professional standards, may well be disarmed by his later remark to Hill, which affords a valuable clue to his attitude to his command and to his cause: "These men are not an army; they are citizens defending their country. . . . I cannot do many things that I could do with a trained army" (III, 331).

Through the campaign of May-June, 1864, from the Rapidan to the James, the interest of the story never wanes. Here, on the defensive at last though not yet besieged, matching his rapier with Grant's bludgeon, Lee, though nearly incapacitated by illness through a fourth of the time, appears at almost his military best. One suspects that to the author the great battles of Spotsylvania, so many and so desperate, are the most familiar of the war. At any rate, the paragraph with which he marks their end is one of the most eloquent in the book. "But never again were the thickets to echo the wild rebel yell. To the thousands of shallow graves in the forest none were to be added. The barricades might rot and the trenches wash away. The trumpet vine might climb the gaunt, scarred trees, and the honeysuckle cover the ruin of the shell-swept homes. Spotsylvania's sacrifices were complete. No more was to be expected of her. The fields and the forests that had witnessed the high noon of the Confederacy were to be spared the night of a waning cause" (III, 344–345).

The general conclusion of the author, in his summary of the whole campaign, is that there is little just ground for criticism of Lee's generalship and much for criticism of Grant's. Even in the crossing of the James, he feels that Lee was not outgeneraled or taken by surprise. Unavoidably, from the nature of the terrain and the disparity of the opposing forces, he lost contact with Grant, but he did not misread Grant's intentions, and he gave Beaure-

gard in every instance the help requested. He insured the safety of Richmond and held Petersburg. Military men may do some arguing on these points, but all will be impressed anew with the brilliance of Lee's generalship at a time when, because of losses among higher officers, the troops "were no longer led as they had been in the period from Second Manassas through Chancellorsville. In the largest sense, only Lee and the men in the ranks still made the army terrible in battle" (III, 447). How terrible it still was the casualty lists showed full well; Grant lost more men in the campaign than Lee commanded at its beginning.

The story of the fighting from Petersburg to the end is less interesting, because of the nature of the operations, and, doubtless for the same reason, is not so clear. The initiative had passed from Lee's hands forever and the doom of his cause was being sounded elsewhere—in Georgia, in South Carolina, in the Shenandoah Valley—as well as in the sad depletion of supplies and men. Some mistakes he made but none of them appreciably affected the final outcome. The account of the inevitable surrender abounds in graphic, poignant details. In the final critique, embodied in the chapter entitled, "The Sword of Robert E. Lee", the author has saved the critics all possible trouble; he seems to have considered everything. His measured judgment, couched in positive terms and avoiding comparisons, is likely to be accepted without serious question. Perhaps the most significant contribution lies in the emphasis on the intellectual quality in Lee's generalship. Despite some mistakes and at least one temperamental flaw, his sometimes excessive amiability, Lee's great ability as an administrator and his genius as a commander seem indisputable, but in them there was more of the painstaking quality than has generally been supposed, and more of the clear thought of an orderly and penetrating mind. In him industry and courage, intelligence and character, were harmoniously conjoined. After reading the full story one finds it hard to believe that, in the circumstances, anyone else could have accomplished more in the aggregate than he did, or that anyone else could have succeeded where he failed.

As a paroled prisoner of war, in the house on Franklin Street, Richmond, just after the surrender, exhausted in body and troubled in spirit, Lee seems an old man. "A week before, carnage, clamor, and the anguish of his country's death spasm. Now, four walls, silence, and a slow fire on the hearth" (IV, 188). Yet he soon assumed a role of leadership, the sort of leadership that he felt his state and defeated "country" needed. Shortly after the presidential proclamation afforded him the opportunity, he made a special application for a pardon. This was never granted him as an individual and his action was criticized by some of his compatriots, but it had the general effect of promoting Southern acceptance of the verdict of arms and submission to civil authority. Then came a call to constructive service which he gladly answered. For five years, laboring in a secluded country college, avoiding all

discussion of war and politics, always exemplifying and frequently proclaiming the doctrine of reconciliation, he became a spiritual leader of his people. After his death, if not during his lifetime, he was enthroned in memory by practically all of them as their uncrowned king.

The activities of these last years, when relatively humble tasks were glorified by the spirit in which they were performed, are described by Dr. Freeman in detail. One sees the President of Washington College visiting classes and examinations, overseeing grounds and buildings, patiently writing letters to parents and contributors, unostentatiously dispelling a crowd of would-be lynchers. Lee was an industrious and intelligent executive, developing the college along sound, practical lines, making a distinct if not spectacular contribution to Southern education, and an even greater one to the morale of the Southern people. Of "his boys" he required "that they be gentlemen in all things, that they study faithfully, that they hold to high moral standards, that they 'remember their Creator', and that they keep the peace" (IV, 285). In all things he was their exemplar. He was misinterpreted, of course, by extremists in the North, but was appreciated by the liberal and well-informed. He generally met aspersions by silence, but occasionally gave dignified expression to his sensible and moderate views. Wherever the former commander of the Army of Northern Virginia went, he was treated by his Southern compatriots with a reverence that foreshadowed apotheosis. To the young it seemed that King Arthur walked the earth. "We had heard of God", said one daughter of Virginia, "but here was General Lee."

In the story of such a man almost no incident seems trivial. From the literary point of view, however, the last part of his biography is rather less satisfying than the middle portions, or even the early chapters which explain his growth. As the author well says, there was in Lee no mystery or enigma. The impression of his humane gentility, of his simplicity and spirituality, is distinct in the reader's mind long before the final pages have been turned, so the massing of details suggests painting the lily. Also, though always critical in his use of sources, the author has inserted quotations which impart to the latter portion of his book a flavor of sentimentality. Southern sentimentality about Lee is itself a historic fact of importance, but it serves to obscure the fact that the man himself was characteristically restrained. Dr. Freeman has held himself so well in hand through so many pages that it would be ungracious to suggest that he yielded to his emotions toward the end. I should probably have done the same thing myself.

The author remarks that Lee was just the sort of man he seemed to be. It may be added that he was essentially the same sort of man that tradition has pictured him. Of him, more truly than of almost any other major figure in American history, it can be claimed that the symbol and the reality, the legend and the man, are practically identical. He was capable of military

mistakes and at times sent men to their doom unwisely; he did occasionally lose his temper; but in life as in legend he was heroic, and the *beau idéal* of the Christian gentleman. Without a tragic setting he would seem an almost too-flawless jewel; but given the background of dark disaster, and of as stirring martial scenes as history affords—given also the wealth of material from which details of his daily life can be reconstructed—he appears as a supreme subject of biography. Now that Dr. Freeman has shown this, it seems obvious. In appraising the military achievements of the Southern commander, he says: "Circumstance is incommensurable . . . why invoke comparatives?" Without appraising other works, suffice it to say that this biography among biographies seems worthy of honor comparable with the fame Lee has won among the great men of his race and tongue.

The Dictionary of American Biography. DUMAS MALONE.

Foreign Bondholders and American State Debts. By REGINALD C. McGRANE, Professor of History, University of Cincinnati. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. vii, 410. $4.00.)

ALTHOUGH it deals with events long past, this book may be accounted of timely interest because of the recent "suspension" of the Inter-Ally debts and the treatment by Germany of American holders of the Dawes loan. The main questions which receive illumination from the rehearsal of the experience of our commonwealths is, first, may a sovereign state repudiate its debts, and, second, what effect will such action have upon its future credit, that is, its ability to borrow again?

The first of these questions is answered conclusively in the affirmative by a detailed and careful account of the defaults or outright repudiation of their debts by seven states and one territory prior to the Civil War and by the scaling down or repudiation of their debts by eight states after 1865, three of these being also in the first group. No attempt is made by the author to answer the second question explicitly although by implication a decided negative is suggested. Light on this question may be had by a reference to the listings of state bonds on the New York Stock Exchange which shows that of these thirteen delinquent states, the bonds of only two, Arkansas and Florida, are at present quoted below par, and for the low credit standing of these states other factors are sufficient explanation.

The origin of the state debts in the 1830's and 1840's is well known to every student of American history. They were issued to finance ambitious and premature schemes of internal improvements, to establish banks, and to provide other institutions which the pioneer population of growing communities needed. The Federal government expunged its debt in 1836, and hence enjoyed excellent credit; the distinction between Federal and state bonds was not fully understood abroad, and so state bonds were eagerly

bought by foreign investors. The ease with which money could be obtained led to extravagance in its use, and when the bubble of speculation burst in 1837 many of the states found themselves in an embarrassing position. Ten of the states had incurred no debt, but an investigation a decade later showed that, while nine of the remaining seventeen had regularly paid the interest on their public debt, eight others were delinquent. These were Maryland, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Florida. Of these states, Maryland later paid in full; Illinois and Indiana deeded to the bondholders the state canals, by which method Illinois creditors were paid in full, but those of Indiana lost; all the other states scaled down their debts, and have never paid in full.

The story of the post-Civil War debts is for the most part one of sordid dishonesty rather than of optimistic overbuilding. Most of the indebtedness was incurred during the carpetbag regime of the Reconstruction period and when the conservative whites returned to power in 1874 many of these debts were repudiated on constitutional grounds. All but one of the delinquent states in this period were Southern: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Minnesota, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. The one Northern state, Minnesota, had repudiated its debt in 1860, but twenty years later it paid fifty per cent of the repudiated obligations.

Professor McGrane finds that creditors were jointly responsible with debtors for the creation and handling of these debts. He pictures the acts of the legislatures in repudiating them as unfortunate but not wholly discreditable, and gives due praise to the courage and self-denial of the people in those states which fully met these onerous burdens.

The question of the repudiated debts of the American commonwealths has recently been revived in two connections. In 1933 the Principality of Monaco came into possession of some of the repudiated bonds of Mississippi and attempted to bring suit against the state; but the United States Supreme Court held that no state could be sued without its consent, which in this case Mississippi refused to give. On more than one occasion the suggestion has been made that the repudiated bonds of the American commonwealths held by citizens of Great Britain or other debtor nations might be set off against the sums which their governments owed to the United States. No action has ever been taken in this direction. "Thus", concludes Professor McGrane, "the rappings of the ghosts of the repudiated bonds continue to the present day."

The University of Illinois. E. L. Bogart.

Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas. Edited by Charles Wilson Hackett, Ph.D., Professor of Latin-American History in the University of Texas. Volume II. (Austin, University of Texas Press. 1934. Pp. xv, 618. $6.50.)

THE first volume of this extraordinary historico-polemical treatise was published in 1931 and was reviewed in this journal (XXXVII, 564), to which place the reader is referred for some general observations on the purpose and character of the work. The present volume, which carries us about half way through the treatise, contains the concluding chapters of a description of the plains of Cíbola, a discussion of the location of four Texas presidios, dissertations on the Indians of Cíbola and on Quivira, and a concluding chapter on the location of the province of El Teguayo. Most of this material relates to the Texas region in the sixteenth century.

The editor states that "among the contributions made by Father Pichardo which fall within the limits of this volume, the two most notable ones are, first, his dissertation on the Indian tribes of the plains of Cíbola, and, second, his argumentative discussion concerning the location of La Quivira and the route thereto of the well-known Coronado expedition in 1541". The first of these contributions is notable because some of the information relating to the Indians of Cíbola "has not heretofore been published and hence may be regarded as a very important source for the investigator".

Pichardo's second contribution—his location of Quivira in East Texas—will arouse keen interest and perhaps lively controversy among historians; for if he is right, then the foremost modern scholars who have investigated this question are wrong. While there has been considerable difference of opinion among them as to the route that Coronado followed, it has been generally agreed that his Quivira most probably lay in Kansas. That this was already the accepted opinion when Pichardo wrote his treatise enhances the interest and value of his very different conclusion; and he was so sure of his ground that he not only located Quivira somewhere in East Texas but also located the center of it with the greatest possible precision, asserting that "if we take the name of Quivira in its narrowest sense, signifying only the country of the Texas Indians . . . it is . . . in 30° 50′ of latitude and 78° 20′ of longitude" (p. 404). He presents a long, detailed, and forceful argument in support of his contention; it remains to be seen whether specialists in the field will accept his conclusions regarding the location of Quivira and Coronado's route thereto. The cautious editor does not commit himself on this question; and the reviewer is equally cautious.

In his preface, introduction, bibliography, copious annotations, and index, the editor maintains in this second volume the high standard that he set in the first. None of the few slips noted by the reviewer is important. The translation, the tentative draft of which was prepared by Miss Charmion Shelby and revised by Professor Hackett, is for the most part couched in clear, simple English. The volume contains a pocket map reproduced from one made in 1811. Historians will look forward with even greater interest to the publication of the latter half of the treatise, which, as the editor has

already told us, contains "Pichardo's greatest contribution in the way of historical data".

Cornell University. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

Edward Atkinson: the Biography of an American Liberal, 1827–1925. By HAROLD FRANCIS WILLIAMSON, Instructor in Economics at Harvard University, Lecturer in Economics and Finance at the Bentley School of Accounting and Finance. Introduction by F. W. Taussig. (Boston: Old Corner Book Store. 1934. Pp. xiv, 304. $3.00.)

IN times like these when our old ideals, traditions, and institutions are in the melting pot, when wise men hesitate and fools parade, it is heartening to turn back to an age of hopeful levelheadedness. When our nation emerged from civil war with the Union preserved and slavery abolished it still faced intimidating problems, but it addressed itself to their solution with self-reliant optimism. This spirit determined the economic thinking of the generation then maturing. Edward Atkinson was typical of that generation. He belonged to its liberal wing, with David Wells, who like himself approached economics from the practical and statistical side, and William Sumner and Arthur Perry, who placed the stamp of academic authority upon its doctrines.

Atkinson was a Yankee inventor and promoter of new ideas and devices. He was in business all his life, as a cotton mill executive and later as the president of an insurance company. He did not have a college education. He never wrote a thesis or occupied an academic chair, but he was author of a multitude of pamphlets of economic import and he was an adviser in the highest councils of the nation. His limitations and his strength were those of self-taught men. Though his reasoning erred at times from lack of theoretical grounding, his convictions were constantly trued by facts. He was an outstanding individualist at a time when most men kept erect without the aid of social stays. He opposed monopolies on the one hand and labor unions on the other. He believed that prices are lowest and wages are highest where bargaining is free from artificial trammels. Consequently he was a theoretical free trader, although he was too close to industry to advocate a precipitate reversal of existing fiscal policies. His inbred integrity and trained business sense made him an uncompromising opponent of the greenback and free silver movements.

We needed a biography of this man, not only to record the activities of a tireless publicist of reform but also to illustrate the political and economic thinking of the period in which he lived. Mr. Williamson has filled this need competently. Atkinson documented his career with nearly three hundred pamphlets and articles bearing upon his work and doctrines. From these the author quotes abundantly. They reveal a wide variety of interests,

ranging from the economic recovery of the South to fireproof mill construction and fireless cookers. They suggest a person with a Puritan passion for bettering things, and with the happy knack of combining rigid principles with flexible applications that makes the New England conscience a practical success. If Atkinson had been a mere doctrinaire reformer he could not have exercised the influence he did. Though he never made national policies he guided in a degree the hands that shaped them. An eclectic in political affiliations, believing in the tariff doctrines inherited by the Democrats and the monetary doctrines espoused by the Republicans, and finding neither party particularly strong in its faith, he was perforce something of an opportunist in tactics, but he never wavered from his main purpose.

These public, and historically important, aspects of Atkinson's life are adequately covered in the present volume. Human detail is subordinated in the portrait. Some readers might like to know whether its subject had a family or like John Marshall pitched horseshoes in default of golf. Subtler promptings than those of the intellect made him the only person among the hundreds whom Henry Adams met during the trying readjustment of America following his young years abroad, "who had offered him a word of encouragement or had showed a sign of acquaintance with his doings". Perhaps, however, the few words of personal appraisal quoted in the concluding chapter tell all the people of today wish to know about the personality of a man who so largely submerged himself in the causes he advocated.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Chester A. Arthur: a Quarter-Century of Machine Politics. By GEORGE FREDERICK HOWE. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1934. Pp. xi, 307. $4.00.)

IN undertaking to write a biography of Chester A. Arthur, the twenty-second President of the United States, Mr. Howe labored under the extreme difficulty of having no body of private correspondence and very few documents of any kind other than official papers. He had to construct his narrative from the writings of Arthur's contemporaries—in many cases his opponents—from such biographies and historical works as dealt with his period, and from references in newspapers and magazines. As a result the work is one of the most impersonal biographies ever composed, for it is almost never able to approach any event or situation from the inside. Anyone who has ever tried to analyze the career of a public man knows that one private letter, not meant for publication, is worth acres of newspaper talk or contemporary conjecture when it comes to explaining actions. From this Mr. Howe is practically excluded. He has to rest his explanations on the assertions of contemporaries or on his own best judgment, and as a consequence he has cautiously kept them at a minimum.

In collecting his miscellaneous material and sifting from it all that pertains to his subject Mr. Howe has shown admirable thoroughness and a sound critical temper. Not only that, he displays noteworthy impartiality, especially in describing the doings of the "Stalwart" wing of the New York Republican party, men who fare ill in most historical writing. The only individual who seems to stir in Mr. Howe something of the same repugnance he stirs in every other writer is Senator Conkling. His personal peculiarities are too much even for Mr. Howe's balanced habits of mind. As a result of Mr. Howe's research we may consider the book as a contribution to the history of two things: Arthur's career in the New York state Republican machine, and his record in the presidency. On each of these he has made a useful critical study, much after the manner of a monograph. He handles the difficult subject of Arthur's relations with Conkling and with Garfield in 1880–1881 with a surprising coolness of judgment, not going so far, in fact, as he might fairly have been entitled to go, in making plausible the policy that Arthur adopted. Similarly, in the presidential administration, where an opportunity was presented for making an effective defense of Arthur's record, Mr. Howe contents himself with presenting the facts, together with sundry contemporary comments upon them and letting them speak for themselves.

One wonders whether, even in a biography written under the strictest canons of historical construction, it is not the proper function of the author to venture into the field of reasonable conjecture in the effort to explain and illuminate the personality and the motives of a man in the position of the President of the United States. Take, for example, the efforts of Arthur, when President, to escape as completely as possible, the consequences of his earlier associations with the New York Stalwarts and with Conkling. So rigidly does Mr. Howe construe his limitations that he will not do more than chronicle the successive steps without an effort to supply reasons or to draw inferences as to Arthur's purposes from the nature of his acts. One would not need to descend to the level of "psychological biography" to make such an attempt. The effect of this abstention on Mr. Howe's part is to deprive the book of personal flavor and leave it with the manner and atmosphere of a monograph, rather than an actual biography. As such, however, it is to be judged a careful and useful piece of work.

Williams College. THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

SHORTER NOTICES

Aids to Historical Research. By John Martin Vincent, Professor Emeritus of European History, Johns Hopkins University. [The Century Historical Series.] (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934, pp. vii, 173, $2.25.)

An Introduction to the Use of the Public Records. By V. H. Galbraith, Reader in Diplomatic in the University of Oxford and formerly an Assistant Keeper of the Public Records. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. 112, $2.00.) Professor Vincent's book is designed to be of use in the training of graduate students for historical research in the social sciences. Nine of its twelve chapters pertain to branches of learning auxiliary to historical investigation; the others discuss briefly such matters as the definition of history, the object of historical research, the importance of proper classification of source materials, the functions of external and internal criticism. It may be of interest to note that in the author's previously published *Historical Research,* only four out of twenty-six chapters dealt with auxiliary sciences. While, accordingly, his new manual does not wholly displace the earlier one, unquestionably it is much more than a mere supplement. For it comprises, in addition to the enlarged (and completely rewritten) account of auxiliary disciplines, a fresh treatment of essentials in historical method; and the entire discussion has been skillfully adapted to the current historical outlook in the social sciences. The bibliography seems ample for its purpose; it is classified, annotated, and quite up-to-date.

Mr. Galbraith has put into print "the substance of five lectures . . . given [by him] for several years . . . to graduate students beginning original research" in the English national archives. The introductory lecture is devoted chiefly to a description of the origin and general character of England's archive system, with brief comment on its merits and demerits. In his second and third lectures the author traces the evolution of the several classes and forms of documents that were issued, and of the records that were kept, by the different branches of the English central government in the Middle Ages; emphasizing the relationship between this evolution and that of the administrative organism itself. The principal changes that have come since *ca.* 1450, in the administration and also in the forms of documents and records, are surveyed in Lecture IV; while in the final lecture, following presentation of some essential data concerning published records, valuable suggestions are offered on archive paleography, the transcribing of records, the method of securing access to the Public Record Office, the arrangement in that office of reference books, indexes, catalogues, etc. Appendixes supply excellent bibliographical guidance and also give the rules and regulations under which the materials in the Public Record Office may be used. The initial difficulties of research in the world's most concentrated collection of national archives will be greatly reduced if the investigator has previously familiarized himself with the contents of this richly informing handbook.

The University of Chicago. EINAR JORANSON.

International Bibliography of Historical Sciences. Edited for the International Committee of Historical Sciences, Washington. Volumes V, *1930,*

VII, *1932*. (New York, H. W. Wilson Company, 1934, pp. cxii, 514; cxv, 525, $9.90 each.) The historical scholarship of over twenty countries, represented by fifty collaborators, contributes to the broad scope of this bibliography. The steady increase in the number of books and articles listed continues, these latest two volumes reaching the totals of 6419 and 6722 titles respectively. This last number is approximately forty per cent above that of the first year. No changes are manifest in the general arrangement of the materials or in historical interest as represented in the subjects investigated, analyzed, and expounded by the historical writers. It is obvious, however, that with the continuation of such numerous lists representing historical activities, these volumes will afford the basis for a study of trends in historical interests that may be of deep cultural value. On the negative side, some areas will be discovered which are suffering from perennial neglect, and on the positive side, abundance of studies in special fields will call for more constructive and synthetic surveys of correlated subjects. The present reviewer, who has long lamented the decline of interest in the study of the classical languages, believes that the revival of interest in the classics will come largely through the stimulus of historical impulses; that the number of students in the secondary schools and colleges with a smattering acquaintance with Greek and Latin may never be so large as it was fifty years ago, but the educational force of the knowledge of the classical civilization will before long be regained with a far greater sense of its vital meaning in social, political, philosophical, aesthetic, and ethical relationships.

This scholarly annual survey of the historical writings may serve as a barometer to record the varying pressures of scholarly emphases, but it will also reveal latent interests which may afford encouragement to some who fear that too much of the past has been forgotten. The plan to bring the *Bibliography* nearer to date is being worked out satisfactorily, the volume for 1932 having appeared in the middle of 1934 and that for 1930 before the end of last year. This leads to the expectation that the volume for 1933 will appear in the very near future, followed closely by that for 1931. Thereafter we may expect the volume for a given year to appear before the end of the following year. Such relative promptness will require some supplementary entries prior to the date which the volume bears.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Yale Classical Studies. Edited for the Department of Classics by Austin M. Harmon, Lampson Professor of the Greek Language and Literature. Volume IV. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934, pp. 234, $2.50.) This volume contains three studies, of which the first (pp. 3–55), by Barbara P. McCarthy, is an essay in literary criticism which ably defends the originality of Lucian's satiric dialogues against the current criticism that they are indebted both for style and content to Menippus. In the second (pp.

59–132), P. W. Townsend has performed a useful task in assembling and analyzing all the sources bearing on the administration of Gordian III (238–244 A. D.). In spite of the meager character of the available material, it is clear that structure of the imperial administrative system was still relatively sound and capable of rendering efficient service under able and conscientious control. The evidence has been interpreted very skillfully, but the style is somewhat marred by unnecessary repetitions, as in the references to the resistance of Decius Valerianus to Gordian III in Spain (pp. 83, 84). In the third and longest study (pp. 135–230), Professor Harmon himself publishes two interesting Yale papyri from Oxyrhynchus containing reports of property made to the land record office, and then goes on to a fundamental discussion of the problems raised by the known documents of this type from Roman Egypt during the principate. That dictation was employed in the land office in preparing duplicate copies of reports seems certain, but more light might be thrown on the question by comparison with the practice of other record offices like the *grapheia*. The author very properly insists upon differences in the form of document developed in the land offices of the several nomes. However, the conclusions that at Oxyrhynchus no reports except applications for *parathesis* received endorsements (p. 164) may have to be modified in the light of P. Mich. III, 179, of 64 A. D., now in press, which carries both a record of receipt and an endorsement. The most significent conclusion of this inquiry is that there was no standing obligation to register titles to property, and that the general edicts requiring such registration had as their object the correction and completion of the office records which had not been maintained in proper order.

The University of Michigan. A. E. R. Boak.

Claudius: the Emperor and his Achievement. By Arnaldo Momigliano. Translated by W. D. Hogarth. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. xvi, 125, $2.25.) The dominance of Tacitus in the historiography of the early principate is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the writing of history. Even those who reject his interpretation have not freed themselves from his favorite methods. It is therefore refreshing to find in the monograph under review an account which breaks with Tacitean technique as well as with Tacitean tradition.

Reviews of the Italian edition (*Rev. Ét. Lat.*, X, 510–513; *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, 1932, pp. 230–233; *Berl. Philol. Wochensch.*, LII, 1487–1490) have covered adequately the controversial points. This translation has been revised in their light. The English is so uniformly excellent that but two or three awkward sentences have been noted. The author's purpose is "to determine the nature of Claudius' contribution to the history of the Empire, and so to history at large". That contribution Momigliano asserts was a real one, dependent upon the character of the man. The first quarter of the book is devoted to

"The man of learning" (pp. 1–19), the scholar who had studied and not inexpertly the past of Rome. Convinced that Rome's success was based on progress, he was a reformer. This thesis is applied in a chapter on "The religious policy" (pp. 20–38) containing much detail on Claudius's attitude toward the Jews. Claudius, the traditionalist, sought to protect the old Roman faith; Claudius the reformer, strove to be tolerant and fair. The Jews interpreted the resultant inconsistent actions as proof of Rome's weakness.

More serious results from this contradiction in aims arose when Claudius attempted to carry on "The policy of centralization" (pp. 39–73). The senate refused the desired co-operation. The equites, frightened by regimentation and the threat of imperial competition in business, were hostile to the point of conspiracy. Only on the frontiers where Claudius had obedient armies was he able to carry out his plan of gradual and cautious reform. To the political observer in Rome frontier successes were unimportant, tolerance and justice to provincials absurd. What he saw were the disgrace of the senate, the punishment of the equites, and a tyrannical government by ambitious freedmen and ruthless women. This is the final picture, preserved in the notorious Apocolocyntosis (pp. 74–79).

J. J. V.

Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait. Edited by J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith, E. F. Jacob. (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1933, pp. xi, 482, 25*s*.) This volume, containing thirty-two papers and a select bibliography of the writings of Professor Tait, is a fine tribute to the scholarly reputation of one of England's leading historians on the completion of his seventieth year. The papers cover a wide range of subjects and periods, and their writers live in many lands, yet, as might be expected, most of the subjects selected are medieval and most of the writers English.

Of the several papers four deal with boroughs and towns, Professor Tait's special field. H. E. Salter describes the duty of repairing the city walls that was connected with certain holdings in Oxford until the thirteenth century (pp. 299–303). G. H. Tupling contributes an essay on the numerous town and village markets and fairs in medieval Lancashire (pp. 345–356). M. Weinbaum discusses the London *Iter* of 1341 (pp. 399–404). I have set forth the contrasts between the lists of parliamentary boroughs selected by the sheriffs and the lists of taxation boroughs selected by the tax collectors from 1294 to 1336 (pp. 417–435).

Among the remaining twenty-eight papers the most provocative is that by G. J. Turner entitled "Bookland and Folkland" (pp. 357–386). In it he vigorously challenges the theories of Paul Vinogradoff and proposes: "Bookland is the land of the thane, the land of a manorial lord, Folkland is the ancient demesne of the Anglo-Saxon Kings" (pp. 385–386). His conclusions

will cause a careful scrutiny of the accepted notions of Anglo-Saxon land tenure. Convincing evidence is set forth by J. G. Edwards in support of his contention that the *Itinerarium regis Ricardi* and the *Estoire de la Guerre sainte* had a common origin in a prose account of the Third Crusade written in French (pp. 59–77). A series of inquests into the holdings of the mendicant friars in 1349 and 1350 leads A. G. Little to the unforeseen conclusion "that all the four orders down to 1350 lived on alms and not on rents" (pp. 179–188). A. L. Poole brings to light the fact that outlawry could be and was occasionally imposed in the thirteenth century upon clerks who failed to purge themselves in the church courts of accusations of felony (pp. 239–246). A. E. Prince describes the prominence of the plan of hiring soldiers under what he calls the indenture system during the days of Edward III.

The value of the volume for historians has been illustrated by the above comments; it may not be neglected by serious students of medieval history.

The University of Colorado. JAMES F. WILLARD.

L'émigration de la campagne à la ville libre de Florence au XIII^e siècle. Par Johan Plesner. Traduction du manuscrit danois par F. Gleizal en collaboration avec l'auteur. (Copenhagen, Glydendal, 1934, pp. xvi, 240, 7 kr.) In this study the author has ably supported Professor Nicola Ottokar's campaign against the old schematic interpretation of early Florentine history as set forth by Salvemini, Davidsohn, and Villari. The work is marked by vigor and incisiveness of mind and indefatigable devotion to the study of the sources. Dr. Plesner's material is drawn from the illuminating records of two rural communities in the Florentine *contado*. These records have been previously overlooked or but incompletely used. Admitting the importance of the light that has been thrown upon the status of the Florentine *cittadini*, before and after their migration, and upon the close connection existing between Florence and the rural settlements in its vicinity, it may still be questioned whether the revisions necessitated by these discoveries revolutionize our general understanding of Florentine history as completely as the author appears to believe.

Dr. Plesner has destroyed the old feudal conception of the Florentine *contado*, including even the *castelli*. He has banished any hard and fast distinction between absolute freedom and utter dependence in the social status of the inhabitants of these rural communities. Many villagers were simultaneously free in some respects and unfree in others. They held land in servile tenure and at the same time possessed ancestral estates, the title for which could be traced back for many generations. It was the most prosperous among them, and not the unfortunates, that migrated to Florence and established themselves among the *cittadini* while still retaining their rural holdings. Thus Dr. Plesner demolishes the idea of a landless Florentine bourgeoisie essentially hostile toward the country proprietors. These are all

conclusions of vital interest and importance. The present study throws little light upon general conditions throughout Italy, but its author believes that he has given material support to Dr. Ottokar's contention that the relation of the Italian city to its *contado* is, in essence, a survival of the Roman *civitas*.

The mechanics of the book are not entirely satisfactory. It is amply and carefully documented, and contains much valuable material in the appendixes. There is, however, no guide of any sort to assist the reader in threading his way through the wealth of minutiae. The decision to keep the author's final résumé in the original Danish language while the rest of the work is translated into French will not commend itself to those who are unfamiliar with Danish. These interesting conclusions were made available for the purposes of this review by the generosity of Dr. Mary W. Williams of Goucher College and Mr. Holger A. Koppel, Danish vice-consul at Baltimore.

Goucher College. KATHARINE JEANNE GALLAGHER.

English Constitutional Documents, 1307–1485. Edited by Eleanor C. Lodge, Honorary Fellow, and sometime Principal of Westfield College, University of London, Honorary Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, and Gladys A. Thornton, Lecturer in History at Westfield College (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. xxv, 430, $3.50.) This volume of about 400 extracts from original sources is designed to fill the gap between Stubbs's *Select Charters* and Tanner's *Tudor Constitutional Documents*. More than half of the extracts are taken from the *Rotuli parliamentorum* and the *Statutes of the Realm;* the rest are drawn almost exclusively from a wide variety of public documents. Slightly over ten per cent of them are printed for the first time from their manuscripts. The original language, Latin, French, or English, is retained throughout; but for purposes of translation brief glossaries of French and Latin terms are appended.

The work is divided into three parts. The section on the Central Government, comprising two thirds of the volume, contains chapters on the Crown, the Council, the Household, the Chancery, the Seals, the Exchequer, and the Courts of Law. The section on the Church occupies only thirty-four pages and includes only thirty documents. The decision to leave this section "slight, in view of the work which is now being done on this period of church history" (p. 289, n. 1), diminishes the book's usefulness. The section on Local Government consists of chapters on the Justices of the Peace, the Sheriffs, the Coroners, the Escheators, the Forests, Seignorial Jurisdiction, and the Towns. Throughout the volume each chapter begins with an introduction and a brief, but up-to-date, bibliography. The several introductions, covering in all some sixty pages, are scholarly summaries of the recent research on their various subjects.

Except for the abbreviated section on the Church, little criticism of the selection of documents is likely to be made. Virtually every document for

this period which is translated in Adams and Stephens, *Select Documents*, or referred to in such standard manuals as those of G. B. Adams and A. B. White is given or significantly represented by an alternate document. In addition, there is much, particularly on administrative history, that is not to be found in any other source book. However, the retention of the original languages makes the work under review more useful for graduate than for undergraduate instruction in the United States.

Hamilton College. EDGAR B. GRAVES.

The Reformation in England. By G. Constant, Formerly Member of the French Historical Institute in Rome, Professor at the Institut Catholique, Paris. Translated by the Rev. R. E. Scantlebury. With a Preface by Hilaire Belloc. Volume I, *The English Schism: Henry VIII, 1509–1547.* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1934, pp. xxi, 531, $4.00.) This is the best book yet written on the Reformation in England under Henry VIII. Its plan is logical, its style is lucid, its documentation is most elaborate. The writer can hardly be said to be impartial, though he states fairly the case for the different parties. However, like the "judicial Hallam", when he comes to sum up, his judgments are all in favor of one side. Thus, the author details the faults of the Church, which had left the mass of Englishmen indifferent or hostile; yet he describes the breach with Rome as "the remote consequence—unheeded at first—of a royal whim". An adverse impression of the reformers is very dexterously given by describing in adjoining chapters the champions of Catholic unity, Pole, Fisher, and More, and the advance party in the schism, Cromwell and Cranmer. The contrast is piquant. The eulogy of the three first named, particularly of More, is on the whole deserved, though it seems strange to relegate to a footnote the description of More's intolerance; but whether Cromwell was as black as he is here painted is doubtful. The case against him is accentuated by making him responsible for the Statute of Proclamations and by misinterpreting its purport. In any event, there is no point in citing Dean Hook's remark that Cromwell had spies in every village and almost in every homestead, or in stating categorically that terror sat at every hearth and daunted the whole nation, for he had no armed force at his command and had to rely on the support of the people at large. Moreover, it is said of Gardiner that he felt bound to accept the ecclesiastical changes as soon as they were the law of the land (p. 388). If More and Fisher could have adopted this theory, they might have saved their heads. One of the most interesting points made in this book is the importance Henry attached to the pulpit, which he recognized as a most potent agency for the formation of opinion. His insistence that the clergy, in their sermons, uphold changes in religion, suggests that he felt the need of popular backing.

An excellent chapter is headed "The Moderate Party in the Schism" and describes the Henricians, Gardiner, Bonner, and others. They were now

ardent advocates of the breach with Rome, but later became the intolerant persecutors of those who were consistent in repudiating the authority of the pope. Generally speaking, the translation and abridgment are good, although presumably an error of translation is responsible for the statement that in 1540 the treasury benefited to the extent of three million pounds (p. 313).

The Huntington Library. GODFREY DAVIES.

Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward. Edited, with an Introduction by M. M. Knappen, M.A., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English History in the University of Chicago. (Chicago, The American Society of Church History, 1933, pp. xiii, 148, $3.00.) The sixteenth century origins of the Puritan theory of church government and the conflict of the Puritan ministers in the reign of Elizabeth with Whitgift and Bancroft have been studied by a number of writers, but hitherto little has been published about their inner religious life. Unlike their better-known successors in Massachusetts and in the England of the Stuarts, they have remained rather shadowy figures, and consequently it has been easy for sociological interpreters of the movement to attribute their intransigence mainly to political and economic motives. Mr. Knappen's chief purpose in publishing this volume is to show that, whatever economic factors may have contributed to the victory of Puritanism under Cromwell, the typical Puritan minister was moved by an ethical ideal and not by any materialistic considerations. The Rogers diary covers the years 1587–1590, its author being a Puritan lecturer at Wethersfield, in Essex. The Ward diary belongs mostly to the years 1595–1599, though a few items were written in later years. Ward was a student at Christ's College, Cambridge, at the date when the diary begins; he was subsequently fellow of Emmanuel, master of Sidney Sussex, professor of divinity, and a notorious pluralist, and with increasing financial prosperity became steadily less Puritan and more sympathetic to the Establishment. The diaries are preceded by careful historical and biographical introductions. The diaries themselves are concerned almost wholly with the moral shortcomings of their authors—with "light thoughts", "liking of worldly profit", failure to preach religion to others, neglect of study, lack of charity, and other such sins. They also record occasions when their authors achieved a sense of spiritual peace and harmony, though there is never any note of eloquence or of mystical rapture. There is also scarcely any reference to the characteristic doctrines of Calvinism, to hell-fire, to sexual sins, to political or ecclesiastical theory, or to the environment in which these men lived. The value of the diaries is therefore chiefly negative; they serve to disprove the more facile and lurid generalizations which have been made about Puritanism; they show that the Puritan minister in the time of Elizabeth was a similar kind of person to his successors in the Nonconformist churches.

New York University. H. B. PARKES.

De Handel op den Viand, 1572–1609. Door Dr. J. H. Kernkamp. Volume II, *1588–1609.* (Utrecht, Kemink and Son, 1934, pp. 407, 4.75 fl.) It was as a dissertation that Dr. Kernkamp began his study of Dutch trade with the enemy during the war of independence, but it has broadened into a two-volume work of considerable historical interest. The first volume ended with the collapse of the Earl of Leicester's well-meant efforts to convert relations between Spain and her rebellious provinces into orthodox belligerency. This second volume brings the story down to the Twelve Years' Truce concluded in 1609, at which point the author rests his case. The developments he has followed recur in well-defined rotation: trade with the enemy is prohibited, but continues notwithstanding; it is legalized subject to special taxes, the *licenten,* and to limitations of destination and character which define contraband; it is prohibited again when the military situation darkens; and so *da capo.* The consistency of this design illustrates the gulf which often yawns between theory and fact. In theory England and the United Provinces were Protestant allies in a war against the popish power of Spain. In fact, while English privateers were snapping up Dutch merchantmen on the well-founded suspicion that they were trading with the enemy, English merchants were not unconcerned in that same trade. And while Dutch men-of-war were blockading the coast of Flanders to English commerce, Dutch carriers slipped through, or went roundabout by river and canal. Nevertheless Dutch capers sometimes took Dutch ships with fine impartiality. Neither sea power permitted neutral shipping to profit by its neutrality. Was war an obligato to trade, or trade an obligato to war? It is hard to tell. They were related activities. In Dr. Kernkamp's work the historical telescope is curiously reversed, and one sees Maurice and Spinola very small and minutely busy over their conventional moves on the chessboard of war. Nor does Elizabeth with her iterated proclamations against trade with the enemy, nor the two Philips with their futile embargoes, show the grasp of *realpolitik* possessed by the Archduke Albert carrying on the war in Flanders with an empty war chest; and by the admiralties and towns of Holland and Zeeland, who appreciated the fact that trade must pay for war.

While Dr. Kernkamp's documentary researches have been in the main in Dutch archives, his reading has been wide and various, since his narrative embraces Baltic and Hanseatic relations with Spain and the Netherlands, and the part played by France in the entwined history of war and war trade.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

Queen Mary's Grammar School, Clitheroe. By C. W. Stokes, M.A., Head Master. Part I, *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* [Remains Historical and Literary connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester.] (Manchester, Printed for the Chetham Society, 1934, pp. ix, 212.) The history of Queen Mary's Grammar School, Clitheroe, has hereto-

fore been dealt with, to some extent, in Whitaker's *History of Whalley*, and Weeks's *Clitheroe in the Seventeenth Century*. The latter, though it corrected errors in the earlier work and gave more extensive information, was written without access to many of the original records of the school, and hence was quite incomplete. The present volume, based chiefly on documents preserved at Clitheroe Castle, and elsewhere, which were recently made available to the author, offers a fairly accurate and connected story of the school from its foundation (or re-foundation?) in 1554 to the end of the seventeenth century. No effort has been made to present a full-bodied history of education as it was carried on in such schools, by straining the documents, or by inferring what might have been true of Clitheroe School from the better-known histories of some of its contemporaries. Instead, since the documents are rather barren in respect to matter relating to curriculum, texts, and internal conduct of the school, there is a fascinating, detailed revelation of the social basis of school control, through a documented recital of the management—chiefly mismanagement—of the school's funds and properties. Very readable and useful to the specialist in educational history, who finds much of significance in the rambling tale told by documents, the volume has little interest for the general reader. An index of names, and a forty-three page appendix (giving the original charter, statutes, a calendar of documents, and a list of governors, masters, and ushers) are included, which increase the book's usefulness to research students.

The University of Pennsylvania. THOMAS WOODY.

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1722–1723, preserved in the Public Record Office. Edited by Cecil Headlam, M.A. (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1934, pp. lxi, 496, £ 1 10*s*.) The two years covered by this volume ushered in the longest period of peace with all her European rivals which Great Britain enjoyed during the eighteenth century. In general, colonial affairs reflected the improved condition of European politics which followed the recent peace with Spain, but in two localities French rivalry produced disturbances. When the Duke of Montagu received a grant of the disputed islands of Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and sent out an expedition to begin settlement, the governor of Martinique landed a superior force upon Saint Lucia and compelled Montagu's lieutenant governor to abandon the undertaking. On the northeastern frontier the activities of the French Jesuits among the Abenaki Indians coupled with the mistreatment of the natives by British settlers brought on the conflict known as Ralé's War, in which the governor of Quebec gave strong support to the Abenakis. But through united action the British colonies gained what they considered a great diplomatic victory when they induced the Iroquois to declare war upon the protégés of France.

In purely domestic matters the papers calendared emphasize the growing

complexity of economic and political problems. South Carolina's extravagant issue of paper currency evoked an indignant memorial to the assembly from local merchants which led to an interesting wrangle over parliamentary privilege (sec. 661). Shortly afterward Governor Keith of Pennsylvania sent to the board of trade a well-argued defense of "controlled" paper currency as a necessity in colonial commerce (sec. 786). Under its new governor, the Duke of Portland, Jamaica entered into the last stage of the protracted contest over a permanent revenue. In reporting the Jamaica assemblymen as "so fond of the notion to be as near as can be upon the foott of H. M. English subjects that the desire of it allmost distracts them" (sec. 779), Portland touched upon the matter that was more and more clearly becoming the heart of the constitutional problem in all the colonies. From Massachusetts, whose governor fled to England for support against the assembly, came an entertainingly caustic commentary upon the character of the people from a private correspondent of the secretary of state (sec. 530), and the surveyor of the customs at Boston urged once more the desirability of a parliamentary stamp tax in the colonies (sec. 328). These two years included few events of major importance in themselves, but they exemplify clearly the growing difficulties of colonial administration.

Yale University. LEONARD W. LABAREE.

The Staple Court Books of Bristol. Edited by E. E. Rich, M.A., Fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. [Bristol Record Society, Vol. V.] (Printed for the Society, 1934, pp. vii, 275.) This volume is divided into three parts—a rather long introduction dealing with the legal and economic background and contents of the printed text, the Staple Court Book of 1509–1513, and the Staple Action Book of 1595–1601. Both of these books are written in Latin, which the editor has elongated almost at every point. They both deal with the recovery of debts, incurred in the sale of goods, loan of money, lease of ships, and so on. Although the law enforced was the local custom of Bristol, it differed only in unimportant respects from the law merchant. The accused was admitted and paid the debt, or he placed himself on the country for trial. Occasionally, the accused was imprisoned for trial, but generally he was too well known for this. If victorious, the plaintiff was allowed his debt, small costs, and sometimes damages.

Between the two books we note a few differences either of kind or development. In the earlier there were more small tradesmen, at least so the editor thinks. Certainly in the later the amounts involved were larger. While in the earlier book there were no lawyers, just an honest effort to obtain quick justice, in the later a few professional attorneys were very active, using chancery writs, bringing about delays, and obstructing justice. How far this was due to the larger amounts at stake and how far to the general development of the time is a question.

The documents are valuable for a study of local law and court procedure, for the history of debts, and for the development of business classes. Unfortunately the records, especially the later book, are not sufficiently explicit to enable us to determine the calling of many of the litigants. Whether we agree with the opinion of the editor, as expressed in the general introduction, we acknowledge our indebtedness for scholarly and readable reproduction of documents such as the serious student is always delighted to have. We seem to get all too few records from the town of Bristol which, from century to century, exhibits peculiarities of trade and position.

Harvard University. N. S. B. Gras.

King James the Second. By F. M. G. Higham. (London, Hamish Hamilton, 1934, pp. 366.) The purpose of this new biography is to give James a "fair trial". The result, unfortunately, is to convict the author of a faulty technique. The "general reader" (whoever he may be) as well as the scholar likes to know where the historian gets his information, especially regarding disputed points, but Mrs. Higham seldom indicates her sources, nor does she ever give the slightest indication when about to tread upon controversial ground. At the end of the book, to be sure, there is a section devoted to authorities, but it is admittedly scanty and furnishes no guide for the information in the text.

Mrs. Higham is generally uncritical of her authorities. In her version of Charles's death, for example, she has evidently used the account found in Clarke's *Life of James II,* or perhaps the letter in James's own hand on which Clarke bases his narrative (Hist. MSS. Com., *Stuart Papers,* I, 3–4). Consequently, the narrative gives to James the sole credit for the arrival of Father Huddleston with the last rites of the Roman Church. It is unlikely that this version is true, for, as Ranke has written in his history (vol. IV, p. 201, n.), and as a letter of Barrillon shows, it was the Duchess of Portsmouth who remembered the king's soul in his last hour, and who instructed Barrillon to tell the duke of his brother's necessity (Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain,* vol. II, app., pt. I, p. 91). This is a small point, perhaps, but it makes the reader suspicious, and displays too great a dependence on a single, shaky authority—Clarke. For as Mr. Winston Churchill has recently pointed out in his *Marlborough* (vol. II, ch. III), Clarke's *Life* is not based on James's own memoirs throughout. The actual authority behind the *Life* and the various other papers surrounding it—Macpherson's *Memoirs,* Carte's *Extracts* —has not yet been determined, but Mrs. Higham should surely inform her readers of its controversial nature.

The literary qualities of the book are scarcely more distinguished than its scholarship. Mrs. Higham's style is frequently naïve and, though her volume is readable, it inspires the reader with little more knowledge and no more sympathy for James than he had before. Only in the account of James's

last days in England does the narrative move ahead with vigor and precision. Then the most unpopular of the Stuarts borrows some of his family's charm, and Mrs. Higham has good prose and good history to her credit. But the faults of the book are too numerous and too important to be counterbalanced by a few good chapters. James II is still a subject for a capable biographer.

Yale University. BASIL DUKE HENNING.

Correspondance de Bouteville. Publiée par Eugène Hubert et Camille Tihon. Tome II. [Académie royale de Belgique, Commission royale d'histoire.] (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1934, pp. x, 599.) When M. Hubert, editor of the first volume (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXV, 666), died in 1931, he had already selected the material for the second and final volume, and had completed the editorial work. This has been seen through the press by M. Tihon, associate director of the royal archives. It does not embody the whole collection of Bouteville's papers, but some five hundred and fifty letters and dispatches, printed in full or in part, addressed by Bouteville to directors, ministers, local functionaries, and military officials. Though M. Tihon could not always perceive the reasons for the choice, he let the selections stand as made by M. Hubert, save for the addition of three dispatches which seemed to be of peculiar importance. "Nous pouvons affirmer", writes Tihon in his preface, "que le choix fait par Hubert permet de se rendre compte exactement de l'activité du Commissaire et d'apprécier la manière dont il s'est acquitté de sa lourde mission dans les Départements-réunis."

In the course of his task M. Tihon discovered certain errors and inaccuracies in the transcription of some of the documents, as well as in the annotation of the work, which he attributes to the impatience of the aging editor to finish the job. At the end of the second volume there are appended, in consequence, seventeen pages of additions and corrections applicable to both volumes. The elaborate index also calls attention, wherever necessary, to the errata.

That this publication is of immense value to the historian of the French Revolution is incontestable, but it can serve only as a guide through the labyrinth of the papers of Bouteville. The indefatigable "Commissaire", while at his post, wrote upwards of three thousand letters and dispatches, and probably received as many more. The student who wishes to exhaust the theme will have to exploit the entire collection.

The University of North Carolina. MITCHELL B. GARRETT.

Europe since Napoleon. By Franklin Charles Palm, University of California. With the assistance of Frederick E. Graham, San Jose State Teachers College. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1934, pp. ix, 890, $4.00.) Although modestly disclaiming originality, a thing admittedly difficult to achieve in a brief general history, Professor Palm has done much more than rehearse a

familiar story and add just another textbook to an ever lengthening list. Without pretending to offer a new model or resorting to tricks of style to create an appearance of novelty, he has produced a book characterized by a certain freshness of approach and a certain correlation and interpretation which, if not strictly unique, are nevertheless the author's own and no mere variation of the conventional.

The period covered is regarded and treated not as a span of years but as an integral epoch dominated by a definite and, it would seem, conscious movement which imparts to it a consistent and organic unity. It is the era of the bourgeoisie, and its entire history may be written in terms of the middle class, its rise, its ascendancy, its setback by war and revolution, its effort to recover. For a century and a half the middle class has been the center and pivot of the political and social struggle, and its energy and ambition the mainspring of every significant movement, democracy, nationalism, industrialism, colonial expansion, imperialism, scientific and technical progress, popular education, liberalism, tolerance, social welfare. The thesis is a plausible one, and ably maintained. One wonders only whether it may not be pressed too far, whether developments so diverse are susceptible of such close articulation, whether in fact any complex period can be fully integrated in terms of a single force, principle, or tendency.

Among the more distinctive features of the book one may note the inclusion of the Americas in the account of the spread of the bourgeois system, and of Japan and the United States as types of capitalism, the analysis of the causes of the World War, the excellent chapters on the war and the Peace Conference, and the section on postwar revolution and reconstruction, a capital illustration of the author's faculty for organization and clarification. The narrative is substantial but not overloaded with detail, omitting nothing essential but free from the superfluous and the irrelevant. The style is lucid, straightforward, fluent; the story unfolds in a clear, orderly, logical manner, easy to follow, easy to comprehend. The author's judgments are sound, moderate, and unbiased. A book so admirable in plan, proportions, content, and form cannot fail to commend itself to the teacher, the student, and likewise the interested layman.

Brown University. THEODORE COLLIER.

Freedom versus Organization, 1814–1914. By Bertrand Russell, M.A., F.R.S. (New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1934, pp. viii, 471, $3.50.) "The purpose of this book is to trace the opposition and interaction of two main causes of chance (*sic*) [change?] in the nineteenth century: the belief in freedom that was common to Liberals and Radicals, and the necessity of organization which arose through industrial and scientific technique."

This is a worthy purpose. How well is it fulfilled? There is an account of the age of Metternich, then some chapters on the various philosophical

radicals and socialists, then discussions of democracy and plutocracy in America, and of nationalism and imperialism in Europe. The biographical sketches are unusually well done, the political narrative is told in an undistinguished way, and the analyses of social theory are competent and interesting. That which the book lacks is a clear and consistent drive along the main path marked out by the promise of the preface and again referred to in the conclusion.

The failure to fit evidence to conclusion is illustrated in the treatment of the shift from competitive capitalism to monopoly in America. Here, according to the thesis, it should have been the evolution of technique that led the way. Perhaps it was, but Russell does not tell us how. He is so charmed by the opportunity of telling over again the famous stories of the Erie Railroad and the origin of the Standard Oil that he does not analyze the actual relations that technology bore to increasing organization. The higher organization of business as he explains it was the result of Morgan's effort to protect investors. There were better demonstrations of the thesis ready to hand, but the author does not use them. He turns to biography and economic theories when a few accountancy concepts, especially the concept of overhead cost, would carry him much further in explaining the relation of technology to organization.

The author is at his best when he is describing, in high irony or with brilliant invective, the conditions of child labor in textile mills, the apologetics of slavery, the ethics of imperialism, or the anarchy of corporate finance.

Western Reserve University. ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

Great Britain and the Cyprus Convention Policy of 1878. By Dwight E. Lee, Associate Professor of Modern European History in Clark University. [Harvard Historical Studies, Volume XXXVIII.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. x, 230, $3.00.) Professor Lee's brief but compact volume is a study of British policy in the Near East from about 1875 to 1880, though its primary concern, as the title suggests, is the delineation of those events which led to the Cyprus Convention of June, 1878. The author begins his work essentially with the purchase of the khedive's shares in the Suez Canal in November, 1875, carries the reader through the story of the acquisition of the island of Cyprus, and concludes with the application of the "Cyprus policy" from 1878 to 1880. He shows conclusively that by 1875 British opinion had a tendency to look with favor on a partition of the Ottoman Empire, in which Great Britain would obtain her share of the estate of the "sick man of Europe", in Egypt or elsewhere. The resentment of the British government over the formation of the Three Emperors' League among Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, with its possibilities of checking British action, is clearly portrayed. The author also analyzes the British plans developed during the Constantinople Conference of 1876 for preserv-

ing the integrity of the Ottoman Empire or for assuring British interests through a possible partition of that decaying political edifice. One of the most interesting parts of the volume is that which deals with the railway projects in the Asiatic portions of the Turkish Empire—schemes which were later to be taken over and developed mostly by German financial and commercial interests with the backing of Imperial Germany.

The work is made up of one hundred and sixty-five pages of text, written in lucid literary style, and about forty pages of documentary materials hitherto largely unavailable. There is a good bibliography of source materials dealing with the period. So inextricably intertwined were the policies of Russia and Great Britain in the region that it is, perhaps, unfortunate that the author has not made available the Russian materials dealing with the same issue. This lack is, no doubt, due to the fact that the work has been strictly limited to a detailed discussion of the development of British policy in the acquisition of Cyprus, based primarily on the papers of Sir Austen Henry Layard, the British ambassador to the Sublime Porte from 1877 to 1880, and the papers of General Sir John Lintorn A. Simmons, inspector general of fortifications, 1875–1880.

Professor Lee's volume is a valuable contribution to the history of British policy in the Near East in the period of the Congress of Berlin and should interest all students who delve into the later phases of the partition of one of the world's great empires.

Miami University. HARRY N. HOWARD.

Saar-Atlas. Im Auftrage der Saar-Forschungsgemeinschaft bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Hermann Overbeck und Georg Wilhelm Sante in Verbindung mit Hermann Aubin, Otto Maull und Franz Steinbach. [171 Haupt- und Nebenkarten auf 40 Tafeln, 110 Abbildungen, einführender Text und Erläuterungen.] (Gotha, Justus Perthes, 1934, 12 M.)

La région industrielle sarroise, territoire de la Sarre, et bassin houiller de la Moselle: Étude géographique. Par Robert Capot-Rey, docteur ès lettres, chargé de cours à la Faculté des lettres de Nancy. [Annales de l'Est, publiées par la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Nancy.] (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1934, pp. xi, 637, 90 fr.)

The Saar Struggle. By Michael T. Florinsky, Ph.D., Associate in Economics, Columbia University. [Prepared under the Auspices of the Columbia University Council for Research in the Social Sciences.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. xiv, 191, $2.00.) M. Capot-Rey in a *note additionnelle* commends the *Saar-Atlas* which appeared only after his own book was in the press. Mr. Florinsky in turn speaks highly both of the atlas and of M. Capot-Rey's scholarly work, and has drawn heavily on both of these books for his popularly written account. These words of praise are well merited. Some of the chapters of Florinsky's book are of but passing

interest. The chapters on "Economic Factors" and "Labor and Social Relations", however, admirably condense material which one struggles through numberless pages to cover in the other books. His discussion of the unpopularity among the Saarländers of the League government is also noteworthy.

The *Saar-Atlas* is a co-operative enterprise. The one hundred pages of commentary explain in brief but clear form the multitude of subjects dealt with. There are of course many economic and political maps. Of more interest are the maps depicting cultural subjects such as the type of settlement, type of houses, folk customs, annual religious pilgrimages, etc. Both maps and pictures are fine examples of German printing skill.

The atlas has a historical section but M. Capot-Rey limits himself to a geographic study. He gives a microscopic account of the physical features, climate, vegetation, and people of the region. With great care he analyzes the mining and metallurgical industries. Although he disavows any intention of passing political judgments, in the end he concludes that on account of her industry the Saar territory would be happier with France than with Germany. His tendency is to show that geographically the Saar belongs with Lorraine, while the German study stresses its historical and cultural connection with the German Rhineland. M. Capot-Rey uses for his data statistics of the depression years 1930–1934; the Germans, the five year period 1925–1930. The authors of the atlas claim that the swing of Saar trade to France in the depression was abnormal and the result of a variety of causes which will soon disappear. The French study holds that the last years are the important ones and that the shift of trade is because of fundamental changes such as the opening of new Dutch mines and technical improvements in the Ruhr industries. As is usually the case each author uses his own figures to prove his point. Since there were no trade figures for the Saar territory before 1919 as it was an integral part of Germany, and since there are no accurate figures for the territory today as the Saar from 1925 on was part of the French customs union, the possibility of argument over trade statistics becomes endless. Freight loadings which provide the basis for statistical comparison become doubly unreliable when trade with one country is largely in finished products and with the other in raw materials. Quite aside from statistics, however, these books furnish detailed, varied, and useful information concerning not only the Saar territory but also the whole Saar Upper Rhine basin.

Bowdoin College. E. C. Helmreich.

Sun Yat-Sen, his Life and its Meaning: a Critical Biography. By Lyon Sharman. (New York, John Day Company, 1934, pp. xvii, 418, $3.50.) This book is the first critical biography in any language of the life of Sun Yat-sen, the "Father of the Chinese Republic". Mrs. Sharman has used

Chinese and Western sources objectively with the result that the reader is presented with a realistic portrait of the patriotic, revolutionary republican leader of modern China and his place in the Chinese revolution. The author deplores the establishment of the Sun Yat-sen cult and the canonization of his writings, particularly of that amazing and frequently naïve hodge-podge of conflicting ideas embodied in the *San Min Chu I*. She fears the paralyzing hold over the minds of the Chinese of the striking limitations of Dr. Sun's own mind. The reviewer believes that the author overstresses the strength of the cult at present which shows signs of decline and with it the hold over the minds of the Nationalist leaders of his programs and ideas.

The existence of the cult, as the author has indicated in her discussion of sources, makes the task of the critical biographer doubly difficult. Moreover, his many years as a revolutionist necessitated a secrecy in his movements and activities which makes it difficult to reconstruct accurately even the bare chronology of events in his life. She has taken considerable care to do this and has cleared up a number of discrepancies in various accounts which would have him, and those associated with him, in widely separated places at the same time.

There is one striking omission, namely, the failure to note (p. 312) that Dr. Sun's body was removed to the mausoleum in Nanking in 1929. The statement (p. 61) that the Manchus sought racial as well as cultural assimilation with the Chinese is not quite right. They did consciously seek a high degree of cultural but certainly not racial assimilation. The Censorate under the former regime was a very important function of government and not simply a "political laureateship" (pp. 294, 295). The unity of the work would have been enhanced if the criticisms of contemporary China and suggestions for reform, set forth in the last chapter, had been indirectly, and hence more effectively, incorporated into the other chapters at appropriate places.

These minor criticisms detract but little from the value of this carefully documented study, which merits careful reading on the part of all interested in the modern history of the Far East.

Columbia University. CYRUS H. PEAKE.

History of Political Thought from Rammohun to Dayananda, 1821-1884. By Bimanbehari Majumdar, M.A., Member of the Faculty of Arts and of Boards of Studies in History, Economics and Bengali, Patna University. Volume I, *Bengal*. (Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1934, pp. x, 509.) This book is of interest and value in more ways than one. It demonstrates, for example, that British rule in India has not involved the extinction of indigenous political thought. On the contrary it is the author's opinion that the discussion of fundamentals has been stimulated by the clash of conflicting opinions as to the merits of British administrative policy. And the inventory

of political polemics which has been compiled in this volume would seem to bear him out, for every conceivable type of civic orientation is represented in it.

The writings of the various Bengali political philosophers which have been cogently summarized in this volume are for the most part wholly unknown in the Western World. But their contributions to the science of government, and particularly to the ethics of nationalism, are by no means of negligible importance. The relation between a government and the aspirations of the governed is never a matter of inconsequence. This volume, accordingly, should be of more than cursory interest to those who would like to know whether British policy and native opinion in India are as widely separated as we have sometimes been led to believe.

Pasadena. WILLIAM B. MUNRO.

Aux origines du conflit Mandchou: Chine - Japon - Paix de Versailles. Par Dom Thaddée Yong Ann-Yuen, O. S. B., docteur en sciences politiques et diplomatiques. Honoré d'une Préface de son Exc. Le Dr V. K. Wellington Koo. (Paris, Paul Geuthner, 1934, pp. vii, 304, 32 fr.) The present work is an able piece of special pleading in which the Japanese fare badly. Surveying in detail Sino-Japanese relations from 1914 to 1919, Dr. Yong seeks to bring out the sinister implications of Japan's continental policy during these eventful years. The factual material used, drawn chiefly from standard English and French sources, is for the most part already familiar to Western scholars. The chief exception concerns the section dealing with the negotiations which lead up to the treaties and notes of May, 1915. Here uncited Chinese material has evidently been used, with the result that these are quite the most valuable chapters in the book. Although he appears to have received direct assistance from M. Lou Tseng-tsiang, head of the Chinese delegation to the Peace Conference, the author leaves untold the story of what actually went on behind the scenes at Paris within the ranks of the Chinese delegates. Included in the appendixes to the book are a number of pertinent documents.

The University of Washington. R. T. POLLARD.

Select Documents illustrating the Four Voyages of Columbus, including those contained in R. H. Major's Select Letters of Christopher Columbus. Translated and edited with additional material, an introduction, and notes by Cecil Jane. Volume II., *The Third and Fourth Voyages.* With a supplementary introduction by E. G. R. Taylor. [The Hakluyt Society.] (London, the Society, 1933, pp. lxxxix, 164, £ 1 11*s.* 6*d.*) The Hakluyt Society's new edition of Columbus documents began with the publication in 1930 of material relating to the first and second voyages, edited by Mr. Cecil Jane. This second volume gives us documents on the third and fourth voyages; unfortunately Mr. Jane did not live to complete his introductory study of Columbus's negotiations with Ferdinand and Isabella, but the sixty pages here

printed, covering perhaps a third of the subject as outlined, are of high value. Professor E. G. R. Taylor has supplied notes on the documents, has mapped the routes of the voyages, and in addition has contributed a supplementary essay on "Columbus and the World Map". The volumes incorporate the material given in R. H. Major's *Select Letters* (Hakluyt Society, 1847) but employ sources which have since appeared as well as the more accurate texts made available in the *Scritti di Colombo,* by Cesare de Lollis. They enhance the high reputation gained by Mr. Jane in Columbian scholarship, and deepen the sense of his loss to the world of learning.

Mr. Jane admits that the accounts of Columbus's negotiations with Ferdinand and Isabella are still no more than conjectural. But deficiency of evidence is a challenge to a scholar of Mr. Jane's imaginative power. He will put himself intellectually in the place of those who lived in the generation of Columbus. He passes beyond the fragmentary islands of documentary evidence and boldly sails on speculative seas. He is a remarkably competent navigator. But his discoveries must be called valuable suggestions rather than conclusions. As such they have to be hedged with all varieties of qualification whose cumulative effect may well leave the reader bewildered.

Professor Taylor's introduction amplifies the sketch of current cosmographic trends given by Mr. Jane in Volume I (p. xxi) and carries further his criticism (*cf. The Geographical Review,* vol. XXI, 1931, p. 509) of Mr. Jane's view as to the objective of Columbus. Mr. Jane felt there was justification for the view that Columbus sought a far southern continent; Mr. Taylor deems that view inadmissible. But now the world hopefully expects new light on this and related problems, following upon the recent discovery in Constantinople of a Turkish map, reputedly a copy of one made by Columbus in 1498. The subject has already had preliminary discussion by Paul Kahle ("A Lost Map of Columbus", *ibid.,* vol. XXIII, 1933, pp. 621 ff.) who has in preparation a longer study of the subject.

Duke University. ERNEST W. NELSON.

Pioneer Padre: the Life and Times of Eusebio Francisco Kino. By Rufus Kay Wyllys, Ph.D. (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1935, pp. xi, 230, $3.00.) This work is a popular attempt to portray the life and work of Eusebio Francisco Kino, pioneer Jesuit missionary and trail blazer in Sonora and Arizona. The missionary was a government paid emissary of good will to the natives, an explorer, pioneer, Indian agent, preacher, church builder, founder of communities, promoter of agriculture and cattle raising, teacher, and map maker. There is a description of the times and country in which the great missionary padre labored. The missionary activities of New Spain, the early Spanish explorations and conquests in the Northwest, the social life of the day, geographic conditions, and Indian life, which are treated, give a fitting background for the account of the ecclesiastic's life.

The author draws heavily from Professor Herbert E. Bolton's translation

of Kino's *Favores celestiales*. Several maps and illustrations add interest to the work. The appendix includes a list of the routes of the more important journeys of the missionary and a short bibliography. The bibliography does not show much evidence of material gathered in the archives of Mexico, under a Traveling Fellowship in Pacific Coast History, as stated in the preface. Political conditions of the times and the causes for expelling the Jesuit Order from New Spain are not discussed. It is to be regretted that there are no footnotes for the quotations throughout the book. The numerous Spanish phrases and expressions are not necessary in a popular work; the translation is sufficient. The typographical and other errors noted are unimportant. The descriptions are vivid and the interest of the reader is held throughout the account. The work should be useful to the general public and to students who desire to know more about the Southwest.

Oklahoma College for Women. LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER.

Washington, nous voici! La France au secours de l'indépendance américaine. Par Robert de Loture. Préface de M. Louis Madelin. (Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1934, pp. 245, 15 fr.) A man's book throughout, *Washington, nous voici!* breathes rather of the open sea than of the cabinet. The author, a *lieutenant de vaisseau,* brings to the reader a tang of the salt air. He creates continuously the impression that his offering is a work of love—for the ocean and its sailors, the fighting forces which the ships transport, the officers of low and high degree, and the Americans whom they fain would succor. Research is evident, but research is not permitted to weigh down the work. It strikes at once the patriotic keynote and sustains it manfully, at the same time that it avoids mere panegyric for the author's countrymen, or the slightest hint of condescension for those to whom the aid was rendered.

The author's point of view is genial. Washington and Rochambeau remain upon their pedestal, quite undisturbed. The weaknesses of Lafayette, apparent to all men by 1792, are here but faintly adumbrated. Why not? The Revolution was the Golden Age for the young marquis. The portrait best sustained is that of François Joseph Paul, comte de Grasse, whose conduct at the siege of Yorktown deserved and won the highest praise; whose subsequent defeat in the West Indies was in no sense due to personal inadequacy, but rather to a national ineptitude for discipline, over which the admiral had no control. Even Louis XVI shares with his subjects in the great adventure, and is credited with intelligence and a sympathetic comprehension of this, the high light of his reign.

But these are only the great names. A surprising number of the lesser men the author rescues from an oblivion which in America, at any rate, had largely overtaken them. Brave and young, they live again and guide their ships with all the proud abandon of a rich nautical vocabulary. For *Wash-*

ington, nous voici! is not easy reading to one perchance whose French is slipping. The sea has a lingo of its own, whatever be the language by which it is conveyed.

A species of epilogue, "La Fayette, nous voilà!" rounds out the picture at a later date. It is conventional, emotional, basically unhistorical, totally inadequate to the motives animating a great nation toward participation in a world conflagration. The merit of M. de Loture's work lies elsewhere. He is not the philosopher historian interpreting great movements. He is the man of action who succeeds once more in making other men of action live.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

The Twilight of the Supreme Court: a History of our Constitutional Theory. By Edward S. Corwin, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence in Princeton University. [The Storrs Lectures.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934, pp. xxvii, 237, $2.50.) At a time when the Supreme Court is more in the public eye than it has been since the period of Reconstruction, this short but excellent survey of our constitutional theory is an especially welcome addition to the literature of judicial review. It is not intended to be inclusive nor is it a completely dispassionate presentation of summaries and paraphrases. Professor Corwin is not concerned with presenting a brief for particular statutes, but in the introduction, he does admit to "a sympathetic interest in the larger features of the New Deal, and especially in its wider-reaching implications", and he sets forth an able argument for allowing Congress to exercise a greater measure of discretionary powers than the Supreme Court has always been willing to concede. For the conception of dual federalism, which he associates principally with Madison, Taney, and White, and with the majority opinion in the first Child Labor Case, he has no sympathy. The nationalism of Hamilton and Marshall is, he contends, the only principle of organization which will allow a government of the present time to deal adequately with the problems which have been the product of the industrial age. But if the theory of Hamilton and Marshall is invoked in defense of nationalization, it is the doctrine of Holmes rather than that of the great Federalists which he defends as far as concerns the interpretation of the due process clause and the principle of delegation of legislative powers to administrative bodies. Of particular interest is his exposition of the extent to which the Court has a free choice of decision in cases involving the protection of property rights, always having a sufficient number of precedents to justify the desired conclusion.

It is the final chapter which warrants the title of the book. There it is pointed out that the Court has so far refused to impose any limitations whatever upon the spending power. There are none of those limitations upon government ownership of business with which the judiciary has hedged about, and sometimes crippled, government regulation of economic enter-

prise. As Professor Corwin says, if so many restrictions had not been imposed upon the latter, there would today probably be less need and less desire for the former. At the present time it seems that, unless the Court alters the character of its judicial guardianship, only through public ownership can certain experiments in something approximating social democracy be attempted.

Harvard University. BENJAMIN F. WRIGHT, JR.

Benjamin Rush, Physician and Citizen, 1746–1813. By Nathan G. Goodman. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934, pp. 421, $4.00.) It seems strange, as Mr. Goodman remarks, that Benjamin Rush has waited more than six score years for his biographer. Certainly his career was sufficiently important to warrant the careful attention of the historian. When his death was announced in April, 1813, Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams: "Another of our friends of seventy-six is gone, my dear Sir, another of the co-signers of the independence of our country. And a better man than Rush could not have left us, more benevolent, more learned, of finer genius, or more honest." Although many students of American history have commented upon the catholicity of Rush's interests and praised his contributions to the life of his generation, this is the first attempt at a full-length portrait of the man which has appeared. Some forty years ago Paul Leicester Ford stated that Rush had written the story of his own life in terms of emphatic self-praise, but there is no indication in the present work that such a manuscript ever existed.

Mr. Goodman's volume is a series of excellent sketches rather than a definitive biography. The reader will enjoy watching the good doctor busily engaged in his various public concerns—poring over Montesquieu and Bolingbroke in the hope of finding a solution for Pennsylvania's constitutional problems, encouraging Thomas Paine to formulate the arguments which finally appeared in *Common Sense,* defending the Federal Constitution as a divinely inspired instrument of government, lecturing impressively to the medical students at the University of Pennsylvania, introducing his numerous apprentices to the theory and practice of medicine, and struggling courageously in 1793 to stay the yellow fever epidemic in terror-stricken Philadelphia. There are well-documented descriptions of his zealous crusading in favor of the establishment of a public school system, the reform of the criminal code, the abolition of capital punishment, the emancipation of the slaves, and the suppression of intemperance. His influence in the temperance cause was far greater than his biographer indicates, for there is no mention of Lyman Beecher's debt to the Philadelphia physician or of the inspiration which the temperance reformers in the state of New York received from Rush's *Enquiry into the Effects of Spirituous Liquors upon the Human Body.* Probably the most significant phase of Rush's thought is

interpreted in the sixteen pages (255–271) which deal with his theories concerning the cause and cure of mental diseases. The chapter would have been more effective if the author had sensed the vital relation between *An Enquiry into the Influence of Physical Causes upon the Moral Faculty* (p. 292) and the whole problem of insanity. But even as the material now stands it throws a flood of light on the tentative suggestions concerning Rush which Woodbridge Riley made in his *American Thought, from Puritanism to Pragmatism*, and it discloses a pioneer practitioner in the field of psychiatry.

Although Mr. Goodman gives us a convincing account of the public benefactions and professional triumphs of Benjamin Rush, he fails to reveal the personality which made possible so distinguished a career.

Columbia University. JOHN A. KROUT.

Amherst: the Story of a New England College. By Claude Moore Fuess. (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1935, pp. xiii, 372, $5.00.) A history of a college is written primarily for its alumni. The alumni of Amherst College may well feel gratified, to the point of enthusiasm, that its history has been written with so much fullness of information, so much literary skill, and so just appreciation of personal characters—for Dr. Fuess rightly holds that the history of a college is primarily a history of men. Secondarily, such a book, written appreciatively but without partiality, is of value to students of the history of American education, especially in view of the large part which Amherst men have had in the work of teaching. But even the general student of the history of American life and character, however unconcerned with the traditions of Amherst, may draw much profit from the book, especially from its account of the first sixty years, 1821–1881, because of its vivid exhibition of a type. The character of a college, at least of a college as homogeneous as this one was, is formed much less by professors and presidents, plans and curricula, than by the quality of the homes from which the students come. The Amherst catalogue bore almost none but Anglo-Saxon names. Almost uniformly, the students were of the old New England stock, their parents of middling fortune or less and of fair education or more, church-going people of the Congregational faith, their fathers either farmers in the country or professional men in the towns whose parents had come from the country, their preparation for college acquired in country high schools or old-fashioned academies. Those who founded the college intended that it should perpetuate this type, preserving the standards of Puritanism and of prae-Hibernian Massachusetts. The record of the struggles and sacrifices made toward these ends by the friends of the infant college is moving and impressive. It may well be instructive, to a generation constantly shown the less amiable aspects of New England Puritanism, to see what it could produce, in the earlier half of the nineteenth century, in fortitude, persistence, public spirit, self-sacrifice, and zeal for education.

The Library of Congress. J. F. JAMESON.

Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, Troubadour and Crusader. By Herbert Pickens Gambrell. (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1934, pp. xvi, 317, $2.00.) This book is an excellent illustration of what happens when a biographer starts out with a preconceived notion of his subject, and then selects his material to substantiate that notion. Mirabeau B. Lamar was unquestionably a strange combination of poet, crusader, idealist, and politician, with enough of statesmanship and practical ability in his make-up to assure him of a high place in the roll of Texan notables. Because he was a prolific and effective writer, he produced much quotable copy, and by careful selection one can take his own words and present many different pictures of him. One such picture is under consideration here. By means of skillfully chosen fragments from Lamar's writings, the author has stressed what might be called the romantic or dramatic side of his career; but in doing so has almost neglected the most important phase of his life—the period when as president of the Republic of Texas he undertook to work out a constructive program looking toward permanent independence for his country. The extensive quotations—many of them four or five pages in length—have been drawn from printed materials without citations of the sources. One who knows the sources of Texas history could locate most of them, however, and having done so, would be impressed as much by what has been omitted as by what has been selected for quotation. Other selections would have changed the complexion of the picture, and a use of important manuscript collections in the archives of the Texas State Library, the University of Texas Library, and the Rosenberg Library, at Galveston, would have saved the author from misleading interpretations or even erroneous statements of fact which cannot be enumerated here. Frequently gaps are closed by means of purely imaginary conversations or impressionistic descriptions, with the result that this becomes an entertaining sketch of Lamar and his times as the author conceived them rather than as they actually were. The bibliography not only ignores manuscript materials but also omits several important printed works on various phases of the subject.

Vanderbilt University. WILLIAM C. BINKLEY.

Jeremiah Sullivan Black: a Defender of the Constitution and the Ten Commandments. By William Norwood Brigance, Wabash College. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934, pp. ix, 303, $3.50.) One of the problems in the middle period of American history is fair appraisal of the much maligned Northern "dough-faces" who sought to defend the legal rights of the South. Jeremiah S. Black was of this class, brought up in the school of Pennsylvania politics as a lawyer and judge who was occasionally spoken of for gubernatorial or senatorial honors by his fellow Democrats. He was a friend of Buchanan and as his Attorney General shared the general unpopularity of his administration; he was especially condemned for his legal

opinion on secession which Buchanan somewhat misused in preparing his final annual message to Congress. At the outbreak of the Civil War, Black was forced out of politics with the other dough-faces and spent the last twenty years of his life as a lawyer and controversialist.

From a biographical standpoint, Mr. Brigance has done an excellent piece of writing. He has caught Black's spirit and has been happy in doing so. Black was a highly charged emotional character of great volubility and clever wit who lived in a dramatic world of his own creation in which he was the chief actor. He was continually playing stellar roles and his dramatic enthusiasm for these parts did not permit tact and discretion. But he was so eloquent and plausible, such a master of clear statement and of the reduction of legal argument to broad fundamental principles that he hypnotized juries, convinced jurists, and captivated his biographer.

Unfortunately, no legal historian has given attention to Black, especially as Attorney General, so Mr. Brigance has wisely refrained in most instances from judgment of his legal significance. He has attributed to Black an influence upon the Supreme Court in the Reconstruction cases which it cannot be proved he exercised and in defending his relations with President Johnson in the impeachment proceedings he fails to realize that with the Alta Vela matter between them it was both unwise for Johnson to retain Black and improper for Black to accept. Neither man showed good judgment. Taking the work as a whole, however, it is a real if somewhat uncritical portrait which does Black full justice. The clear and judicious account which is presented of the troubled period, November, 1860–March, 1861, is the chief general contribution of the book.

The University of Pennsylvania. ROY F. NICHOLS.

George Frisbie Hoar. By Frederick H. Gillett. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934, pp. 311, $3.50.) The writer and the subject of this biography had much in common. Each of them, after years of distinguished service in the House, became a senator. Their political outlook was similar, and their service in Washington overlapped by nearly a dozen years. And the task of writing the book was made the more congenial by the fact that the enormous store of correspondence, manuscripts, and books could be studied in the room that was dearest to Senator Hoar's heart, the booklover's library in his Worcester home.

While the most significant features of Senator Hoar's career had been discussed at length in his *Autobiography of Seventy Years,* the manuscript of which reached the publisher only a short time before his death, they are here set forth with admirable detachment in their changed perspective at the end of a full generation. The characterization of the man in appearance, manner, and personality is well drawn. With keen discernment, James G. Blaine described young Hoar as faithfully reproducing in his own person

the positive virtues of the Puritans, "even with the spice of acridness which distinguished them".

Senator Gillett presents an interesting discussion of the reason why Mr. Hoar, who "differed from his Republican associates and sided with their opponents, and practiced an individual independence more than any of his contemporaries", nevertheless "was generally classified as a rabid and bigoted Republican", and sums up his conclusion: "When principles were at stake he always followed his convictions, and when candidates for office were to be elected he always supported the Republicans." The most powerful speech in the Senate in opposition to the constitutional amendment providing popular election of senators was made by Senator Hoar. After six years of service in the Senate and a score of years of observation of the working of popular election, Senator Gillett comments dryly: "I do not think the force of his [Hoar's] argument has been weakened by our experience since the Constitution was amended in opposition to his views."

Most timely in this study of Senator Hoar's career is the recounting of his determined fight, backed by the vote of only one of his Republican colleagues, against the policy of "Imperialism" in the Philippines. Commenting upon the dramatic debate between Senators Beveridge and Hoar upon the resolution declaring it to be the intention of the United States to retain the Philippine Islands and to "establish and maintain such government control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand", and writing thirty-five years later Senator Gillett says: "I think our history since then has brought a general consensus of opinion as to whose policy was right."

Worcester Polytechnic Institute. GEORGE H. HAYNES.

The Economic Literature of Latin America: a Tentative Bibliography. Compiled by the staff of the Bureau for Economic Research in Latin America, Harvard University. Volume I. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. xvii, 315, $4.00.)

Brazil: a Study of Economic Types. By J. F. Normano. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, pp. xii, 254, $3.00.) The *Tentative Bibliography,* initiated by J. F. Normano and completed under the general supervision of Professor C. H. Haring, does not pretend to be a complete inventory; it is merely a "preliminary representative listing" for the use of economists. The first volume, containing 6244 titles, relates to South America; the second will cover the remaining Latin American countries. In each main division are subtopics on economic and social theory, Indian economy, colonial economy, economic geography, agriculture, industry, currency and banking, and the like. The introduction is a critical consideration of the meager available bibliographical material on Latin America. Scattered through the book, at the heads of various sections, are briefer essays or paragraphs commenting upon existing bibliographies on these more limited fields.

The compilers wisely refrained from attempting to evaluate each of the titles listed in the volume. There is a good index and an appendix of "Notes on the Statistical Sources of South America". The work is a valuable contribution to Latin American bibliography.

Mr. Normano's *Brazil: a Study of Economic Types* is critical and well documented, and is based to a considerable extent upon primary sources. Many statistical charts are introduced. The seven chapters discuss the following topics: "The Moving Frontier"; "The Perpetual Change in the Leading Products"; "The Leading Economic Types"; "The World Economic Waves in Brazil"; "A Century of Public Finance"; "Currency and Banking"; "The Second Republic". The style of the book is impaired by the use of many long quotations from other writers. Readers unfamiliar with the history of Brazil may be confused by the various senses in which the word *paulista* is used. On the whole, however, the presentation is clear, and the author's conclusions seem valid. He believes that the inequality of adjustment between economic and political Brazil, resulting from the "moving frontier", explains the perpetual shift in the leading commodities of the country and in the economic types, and also that it accounts for the erratic history of finance and currency. The book has an index, a useful glossary of Brazilian terms, and a classified bibliography. It is the best general work in English for the subjects considered.

Goucher College. MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the Association will be held in Chattanooga on December 27, 28, 29, and 30. The joint headquarters will be the Patten Hotel and the Read House. Professor Culver H. Smith is chairman of the committee on local arrangements. The chairman of the program committee, Professor J. Fred Rippy, is able to announce tentative plans for the meeting. There are to be four general sessions. The first, on the afternoon of December 27, will deal with the theme "War and National Policy". On the evening of the same day the general subject will be "The Foreign Relations of the United States since 1898". The third general session will be a dinner meeting on Sunday evening at which an address will be given on the TVA. The fourth general session will be a luncheon meeting on December 30 during which the topic for discussion will be "Reviewers Reviewed". The Presidential Address will be given on the evening of December 28.

Other sessions will deal with the following fields: Ancient History (discoveries resulting from recent excavations); Medieval History; Modern and Early Modern European History; English History (with special reference to the Church); History of the United States (with emphasis on Confederacy and the recent period); History of the Far East; Hispanic American History; and the Teaching of History. Joint sessions will be held with the American Political Science Association, the American Military History Foundation, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Agricultural History Society, and the State Historical Societies and Archivists. The morning of December 30 will be devoted entirely to joint sessions with the American Political Science Association.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Mediaeval Academy of America will have dinner meetings, and luncheons will be arranged for the Hispanic American, European, and Southern history groups, as well as for the editors of historical publications.

Part XI of the Report of the Commission on the Social Studies is entitled *The Social Sciences as School Subjects* (Scribner's, 1935, pp. xiii, 541). The author is Professor Rolla M. Tryon of the University of Chicago.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

[Research work undertaken to satisfy the requirements of advanced degrees not included]

XVIII. The United States.

(3) Economic

The farmers movement in American history, an interpretation. Prog. Louis Bernard Schmidt, *Iowa State College.*

Agrarianism and industrialism in the United States, 1850–1860. *Id.*

(8) Since 1782

The political significance of the office of Postmaster General, 1829–1929. Prog. 3 yrs. Dorothy Ganfield Fowler, New York City.

(12) Middle West

The United States District Court in Kansas from 1854. Prog. Hortense Balderston Campbell, *Wichita City Library.*

THE SCANDINAVIAN HISTORICAL CONGRESS

Among the most important of the international historical gatherings, participated in by historians of different countries but of the same or closely related languages (*i.e.,* Anglo-American Historical Conference, the German "Historiker Tag", the Franco-Belgian "Journées", etc.), is the Scandinavian Historical Congress (Nordiska Historikermötet), held at irregular intervals since the Great War, of which the seventh was held in Stockholm and Uppsala on August 9–12. About 400 scholars attended the congress from Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, and Esthonia, and there were four from the United States (Professor Ebba Dahlin, University of Washington, Professor J. H. Wuorinen, Columbia University, Professor Waldemar Westergaard, University of California at Los Angeles, and Dr. Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies). The program and arrangements were in charge of a Swedish committee of which Professor Sven Tunberg and Dr. Salomon Kraft, both of Stockholm, were respectively president and secretary. The program included twenty-seven papers, which were distributed between three general morning sessions, and eleven sectional sessions, held in the afternoons. A variety of subjects was treated, but there was a certain concentration upon peasant history, upon the period of Charles XII, and upon military history.

A particularly interesting feature of the congress consisted of the visit to Uppsala, and to Gamla Uppsala, where a lecture on the royal mounds was given by Professor S. Lindquist, of the excursion by boat to the ruins, mounds, and sites of Adelsö and Birka, and of the two-day excursion, after the congress, by motor, to Sigtuna, Skokloster, Badelundaås, Västerås, Tidö Strängnäs, and Gripsholm, at which lectures were given by scholars especially acquainted with the respective localities.

Notable social events were the reception and supper in the magnificent Stadshus of Stockholm, luncheon at Uppsala, as the guests of Professor Ludwig Stavenow, and the banquet in the great hall of the Uppsala Castle.

Opportunity was also offered for special meetings, such as those of the

archivists of the Northern countries, who discussed technical problems, and especially of the committee on the revision of historical textbooks. This latter, which has been in existence for some years, and which is composed of representatives of the Northern countries, has under consideration the improvement of historical textbooks especially by the rectifying of tendencious or incorrect statements likely to stimulate nationalistic prejudices.

It is impossible not to be impressed by the important work that is being done in the field of Northern European history, as evidenced by the program of the congress, and also not to wish that more of it might be available in one of the languages most used by American historians. Fortunately, however, a certain number of the latter have an inherited or acquired proficiency in the Scandinavian languages, and the presence of three such at Stockholm is an encouraging sign. The next Scandinavian Historical Congress will be held at Oslo in 1940.

W. G. L.

PERSONAL

William Forbes Adams, associate professor of history at the University of California at Los Angeles, died on July 27 at the age of 37. A graduate of Stanford University and a Rhodes Scholar, he took his doctorate at Yale University. He had been a member of the faculty of the University of California since 1929. In 1932 he published an important volume entitled *Ireland and Irish Emigration to the New World from 1815 to the Famine.*

Henry Robinson Shipman, associate professor of history at Princeton University, died on August 12 at the age of 58. A graduate of Yale in the class of 1899, he took his doctorate at Harvard in 1904. The following year he was one of the group which Woodrow Wilson, then president of Princeton, brought to Princeton to inaugurate the preceptorial system. He had completed, therefore, thirty years service as a member of the faculty of that university. Well known for his attainments in bibliography, he was one of the committee chosen by the American Historical Association to direct the compilation of *A Guide to Historical Literature,* and, after the retirement of the first chairman, Professor George M. Dutcher, he shared with Professor Sidney B. Fay the chief editorial responsibility. His self-sacrificing devotion to this task will be long remembered with gratitude.

Francis Charles Montague, professor emeritus of history at the University of London, died on April 8 at the age of 75. Among his writings were *Elements of English Constitutional History* (1894) and *The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Restoration* (1907), a volume in the Longmans series. He was also a contributor to the *Cambridge Modern History.*

Kate Norgate, who died on April 17, had done notable work in the history of medieval England. Her *England under the Angevins,* which ap-

peared nearly fifty years ago, reminds us that she was a contemporary of Freeman and Green. She was a lifelong friend of Mrs. Green, also a historian. Although she worked mainly with printed sources her interpretations are of lasting value.

Prosper Benjamin Boissonnade, honorary dean of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Poitiers, died recently at the age of 73. His principal field was economic history and he published many important works. Among these were: *L'organisation du travail en Poitou, XII^e^-XVIII^e^ siècles* (1900); *Études relatives à l'histoire économique de la France* (1903–1906); *Histoire des relations économiques entre la France et l'État prussien* (1912); *Histoire du travail dans l'Occident chrétien au moyen âge* (1921, Eng. tr., 1927); *Colbert et la Compagnie du commerce du Nord, 1661–1689* (1930). He edited the *Cahiers des sénéchaussées d'Angoulême et de Cognac* (1909), and [with L. Cathelineau] the *Cahiers de Civray* (1925). One of his early contributions to local history was *Histoire des volontaires de la Charente pendant la Révolution* (1890).

Joannès Tramond, professor at the École de guerre navale and chief of the historical section of the French ministry of marine, died recently at the age of 53. His death is a great loss to studies in naval history. His was the principal share in the preparation of the *Bibliographie d'histoire coloniale, 1900–1930* (1932). To the *Histoire de la marine,* in course of publication, he contributed the chapters on the eighteenth century, the Revolution, and the Empire. His *Manuel d'histoire maritime de la France* (1916) is a valuable work of reference.

Another loss to French historical scholarship is due to the death of Gustave Glotz, the distinguished Hellenist, and the general editor of a *Histoire générale* which is in course of publication by Les Presses Universitaires de France. He was the author of *La cité antique* (1928, Eng. tr., 1929), *La civilisation égéenne* (1923, Eng. tr., 1925), and *Le travail dans la Grèce ancienne* (1920, Eng. tr., 1926).

Anton von Premerstein, professor of ancient history at the University of Marburg, died on February 6 at the age of 66. His field of interest was the Roman Empire.

The spring number of the *Bulletin* of the Friends' Historical Association contains several memorials of the late Professor Rayner Wickersham Kelsey, of Haverford College, a bibliographical list of his writings, with an article which he had prepared on "Early Books of Discipline of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting".

The July *Washington Historical Quarterly* is devoted to memorials of Professor Edmond S. Meany, including a bibliography of his writings.

Dr. James A. Robertson has been appointed archivist of the new Hall of

Records of the State of Maryland, which is located at Annapolis. He assumes his new duties this month.

Dr. A. G. Doughty has retired from the position of deputy minister in charge of the Public Archives in Ottawa. His service in the archives had continued for thirty-one years. He remains as chairman of the public records commission. Dr. James F. Kenney has become acting dominion archivist.

Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes has been named Seth Low Professor of History in Columbia University.

Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger was awarded the Joseph Sullivant gold medal at the commencement exercises of the Ohio State University on June 10. This medal is awarded once in five years to that alumnus of the university who has made a notable contribution to learning. Professor Schlesinger also delivered the principal address before the Alumni College, his theme being "The American Way of Life: an Historical Interpretation".

The following appointments may be noted: *Colgate University,* Charles R. Wilson as assistant professor; *Northwestern University,* Tracy E. Strevey and Franklin D. Scott as assistant professors; *University of Tennessee,* Jennings B. Sanders as professor of history and head of the department.

Announcement is made of the following promotions: *University of Michigan,* Dwight L. Dumond to be associate professor; *University of Nebraska,* Edgar N. Johnson to be associate professor; *Stanford University,* David Harris and Max Savelle to be associate professors.

Dr. Walter Livingston Wright, jr., assistant professor of history, Princeton University, has resigned to assume, with the current academic year, the presidency of Robert College and the American Women's College at Istanbul.

Professor R. H. Shryock is on leave of absence for the current academic year from Duke University, and during this time is to serve as Fellowship Secretary of the Social Science Research Council.

Dr. Howard K. Beale is visiting professor of American History for the current year at the University of North Carolina.

During the past summer Professor Conyers Read and Professor James F. Willard have been Visiting Scholars at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California. Professor Merle E. Curti is to be a Visiting Scholar for one year beginning in February, 1936. Professor Curti will carry on his investigation of certain aspects of the intellectual development of the United States.

The Secretary of the Interior has appointed as Executive Secretary of the Division of Geographic Names, Dr. George Curtis Martin, of Corvallis, Oregon. Dr. Martin was for twenty years a geologist of the United States

Geological Survey and has made a special study of the problem of place names throughout the United States.

GENERAL

General review: Hubert Hall, *The Reconstruction of Business History* (Quar. Rev., July).

The American Council of Learned Societies will continue its grants in aid of research on the established terms. Applications must be made in duplicate upon special forms provided for that purpose, and must be mailed to the Secretary for Fellowships and Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., not later than January 15, 1936.

The Naval War College has issued *International Law Situations, with Solutions and Notes: 1933* (Government Printing Office, 1934, pp. v, 150, $1.00). Like its predecessors, it has been prepared by Professor George Grafton Wilson, of Harvard University.

The committee of the Anglo-American Historical Conference has appointed a subcommittee on a survey of place names of the British dominions and colonies. "The survey is to be limited to those place names, other than native ones, which are of interest for the history of the settlement in question, and will deal, in the first instance, with Canada, Newfoundland, South Africa, Rhodesia, Australia, New Zealand, and the West Indies." Professor Marcus L. Hansen, of the University of Illinois, has been made a member of this subcommittee.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, in order to facilitate research, keeps a file of subject headings in which individual scholars are interested, and undertakes to call the attention of these scholars to new discoveries of pertinent material. The society will furnish cards for filing such subjects upon application to Mr. Julian P. Boyd, the librarian, at 1300 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

The newly appointed general editor of the *Victoria County History* is Mr. L. F. Salzman, who since 1909 has been honorary editor of the Sussex Archaeological Society. The *Victoria County History* is now controlled by the Institute of Historical Research. Sir Charles Peers is chairman of the special committee in charge. The second volume for Rutland has just appeared. Other volumes soon to be published are the third volume for Huntingdon and the third, and possibly the ninth, for Sussex. Work is advanced on the Northamptonshire ninth volume, the fourth for Kent, first and second for Cambridge, and first for Oxford.

Among pamphlets lately put forth by the British Academy (Humphrey Milford), special historical interest attaches to a lecture by Sir Denison Ross

on "Marco Polo and his Book", discussing the various recensions, to a Henriette Hertz Lecture by M. Étienne Gilson on St. Thomas Aquinas, and to a Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture by Dr. A. G. van Hamel on "Aspects of Celtic Mythology".

The Société d'histoire moderne has made another contribution to effective scholarly work in *a Bibliographie critique des principaux travaux parus sur l'histoire de 1600 à 1914, en 1932 et 1933* (Maison du Livre Français, 1935, pp. vii, 227). It is prompted by the practical consideration that the more ambitious bibliographical enterprises are after all lists, relatively complete, but carrying no critical appreciation of the works mentioned. The student and the librarian remain, therefore, at a loss as to what is important for their purposes. The present bibliography gives summary statements in regard to the more significant books listed. Sometimes these are purely descriptive, often they are critical in the best sense of the term. Many books have been listed without comment. That there are omissions Professor Georges Pagès, chairman of the editorial committee, confesses. The plan had called for collaborators in each country, but no response could be gained, for example, from the U. S. S. R. It was originally proposed that failure to mention a work would be "la meilleure forme de condamnation". The editors also had the interesting idea of marking with an asterisk the titles of works that might well have been left unpublished. These schemes had to be abandoned, at least until the committee has increased its body of collaborators. The reviews and comments which are included, will, however, be read with great interest. It is to be hoped that the committee can publish, as it intends, a similar bibliography every two years.

Annales de l'Est, 1935, no. 2, is made up of a "Bibliographie Lorraine" for 1933 (Nancy, Berger-Levrault, pp. vii, 136, 18 fr.).

The following significant volumes deal with the contemporary scene, its historical background as well as its problems: *International Security: the American Rôle in Collective Action for Peace* (Council on Foreign Relations, 1935, pp. xxiii, 157, $1.50), by Philip C. Jessup, associate professor of international law in Columbia University; *The Need for Constitutional Reform: a Program for National Security* (Whittlesey House, 1935, pp. x, 286, $2.50), by W. Y. Elliott, professor of government in Harvard University; and *The Nazi Dictatorship: a Study in Social Pathology and the Politics of Fascism* (Knopf, 1935, pp. xiii, 494, $3.50), by Frederick L. Schuman, professor of political science in the University of Chicago.

Among the recent additions to the Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, edited by the faculty of political science at Columbia University are: *The New York Merchant on the Eve of the Revolution* (pp. 389, $4.50), by Virginia D. Harrington; *Women in Eighteenth-Century America* (pp. 343, $4.00), by Mary Sumner Benson; *Britain and the Balkan Crisis, 1875–*

1878 (pp. 433, $5.00), by Walter George Wirthwein; *The Attitude of Voltaire to Magic and the Sciences* (pp. 299, $3.75), by Margaret Sherwood Libby.

Under the auspices of the Catholic University of America the following dissertations in the historical field have been published: *The Diplomatic Career of Joel Roberts Poinsett* (1934, pp. viii, 161), by Dorothy M. Parton; *Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan: a Study in American Historiography, 1797–1880* (1934, pp. x, 92), by Francis Shaw Guy; *The Catholic Church in the Meeting of Two Frontiers: the Southern Illinois Country* (1935, pp. xiv, 170), by Fintan Glenn Walker; *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana, 1700–1763* (1935, pp. xxvi, 547), by Jean Delanglez; *The Benedictine Congregation of Saint Scholastica: its Foundation and Development, 1852–1930* (1935, pp. viii, 154), by Mary Regina Baska; *The Colonial Agents of New England* (1935, pp. v, 156), by James J. Burns.

The thirtieth annual cumulation which makes up the new volume of *The Book Review Digest* (H. W. Wilson, 1935, pp. v, 1183) covers the period from March, 1934, to February, 1935, inclusive. The editors are Marion A. Knight, Mertice M. James, and Dorothy Brown.

The Librairie Plon has issued new editions of Edmond Géraud's *Journal d'un étudiant pendant la Révolution, 1789–1793*, edited by G. Maugras, and Gustave Schlumberger's *Le siège, la prise, et le sac de Constantinople par les Turcs en 1453* (15 fr., each). From the same firm come also *Le ménage Beauharnais: Joséphine avant Napoléon* (12 fr.), by Jean Hanoteau, and *Le maréchal Pilsudski* (13 fr. 50), by Paul Bartel.

When Thomas Adams, author of *Outline of Town and City Planning* [Foreword by Franklin D. Roosevelt] (Russell Sage Foundation, 1935, pp. 368, $3.00), came to this country, some twenty years ago, city planning was in the amateur stage. Washington indeed had the century old L'Enfant plan, that, in 1901, had been brought down to date by the Senate park commission. The members of this commission achieved the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, thereby effectively calling attention to the disorderly physical conditions prevailing in American cities, and also showing the way to betterment. The beginnings of the regenerative work were entrusted to architects and landscape architects of reputation, who took it up as an avocation, quite outside their regular work. Amateurs they were in their new subject; but they planned largely and sought beauty along with orderliness and convenience. Usually they gave their services to eager communities. Mr. Adams, himself an architect, came from practice in England, where city planning was a profession. He introduced here professional ideas and methods, and himself became associated with the regional plan of New York and a professor in the first American school of city planning at Harvard. His wide experience has resulted in a historical review of the planning of cities from ancient times to the present day. The historian will find Mr. Adams's book most helpful

as a guide to social conditions expressed in the arrangement and growth of the great cities of the world. City planning has been a favorite sport of rulers from the days of the Pharaohs and Nebuchadnezzar to those of President Washington and Napoleon III. They, happily, did not have to deal with problems of traffic, which now form the most engrossing portion of civic study. The automobile is fast subordinating amenity to speed; and shortly Mr. Adams's book may become a manual of archaeology and his plans a record for the historian of conditions "progress" has made obsolete. In any case it is a comprehensive, intelligent, and intelligible guide through an intricate subject. C. M.

Dr. Alexander Clarence Flick's *Modern World: History since 1775* (Crofts, 1935, pp. xi, 667, $5.00), originally published in 1926, has been completely revised and brought down to date by Dr. Witt Bowden of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, formerly assistant professor of history, University of Pennsylvania.

The American Correspondence of a Bristol Merchant, 1766–1776: Letters of Richard Champion, edited by Professor G. H. Guttridge, has been added to the series of the University of California Publications in History. To the same series belongs also *Effects of the Germanic Invasion in Gaul, 234–284 A. D.,* by Inza Jane Manley.

Articles: Robert Livingston Schuyler, *Can History Educate?* (Columbia Univ. Quar., June); Roy F. Nichols, *The Dynamic Interpretation of History* (New Eng. Quar., June); H. J. Fleure, *The Bearing of Changes of Climate on History* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); Peter Brieger, *The Relations of History, Geography, and Art* (History, June); Miron Korduba, *Michael Hruševśkyj als Forscher und als Organisator der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., V, no. 2); Oskar Halecki, *Der Begriff der osteuropäischen Geschichte* (*ibid.,* no. 1); Richard Livingstone, *Greek Ideals in Modern Civilization* (Yale Rev., June); Herbert Wood, *The Titles of the Chief Governors of Ireland* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, June); L. Philippart, *Essai sur le mot et la notion d'Humanisme* (Rev. Synthèse, June).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The Oriental Institute report of archaeological excavations in progress in the Near East is presented by R. M. Engberg in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* for July. With this should be noted C. Contenau on excavations in Western Asia in the *Revue archéologique* for June, A. Parrot's preliminary report of the excavations at Mari in *Syria,* XVI, no. 1, and C. Bache on the excavations at Tepe Gawra in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for June. In the same journal there also appears T. L. Shear's summary report on discoveries in the Agora at Athens and E. P. Blegen's regular letter of news items. There is also a report of the third campaign at

Olynthus by D. M. Robinson. A report of excavations at Gergovia appears in the *Revue archéologique* for June.

A bibliography of the works of Adolf Erman, containing many items of interest to historians, is published in *Zeitschrift für aegyptische Sprache,* LXXI, no. 1. H. M. Last contributes a review of the study of Roman history in Great Britain since 1919 to *Studi romani nel mondo,* II. Note also J. Miller's report on the historical literature about the period from Diocletian to Theodosius I in *Bursian's Jahresbericht,* CCXLVI.

The *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LVIII, no. 2, contains several articles publishing new inscriptions; one may note those of Philippi by P. Lemerle, and of Thasos by M. Launay, a group from Caria by A. Laumonier and with these last note L. Robert's corrections. W. H. Buckler has published some documents from Phrygia and Cyprus in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* LV, no. 1. On papyri note in *Aegyptus,* for April, A. Zambon's "Didascalikai", and some new documents edited by Medea Norsa, A. Calderini, and others.

The American Numismatic Society has issued *A Bibliography of Byzantine Coin Hoards,* prepared by Sawyer McA. Mosser. It is No. 67 of the series entitled "Numismatic Notes and Monographs".

For literary sources there have appeared articles by A. Momigliano on the "Historia" of Ephorus and the "Hellenica" of Theopompus in *Rivista di filologia* for June, and A. Klotz on the sources of Plutarch's life of Quintus Fabius Maximus in *Rheinisches Museum,* LXXXIV, no. 2.

In the field of history of religion the following articles have some general importance: A. J. Festugière, "Les Mystères de Dionysus" in *Revue Biblique* for April; F. Müller, jr., "Studia ad Terrae Matris cultus pertinentia" in *Mnemosyne,* III, nos. 2, 3; and particularly M. P. Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler Cult, Especially in Rome", in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January.

Articles: N. F. Wheeler, *Pyramids and their Purpose:* [II] *The Pyramid of Khufu* (Antiquity, June); W. G. Williams, *The Ras Shamra Inscriptions and their Significance for the History of Hebrew Religion* (Am. Jour. Sem. Lang., July); J. H. Oliver, *The Marathon Epigrams* (Am. Jour. Philol., July); D. M. Robinson, *The Athenian Decree on Coinage* (*ibid.,* Apr.); W. Judeich, *Die Schlacht bei Oenoe* (Hist. Zeitsch., CLII, no. 2); U. Wilcken, *Zur oligarchischen Revolution in Athen vom Jahre 411 v. Chr.* (Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad., 1935); G. De Sanctis, *Contributi epigrafici alla chronologia della guerra deceleica* (Riv. Filol., June); F. Hempl, *Die Bottiaeer* (Rhein. Mus., LXXXIV, no. 2); G. Daux, *Sur la loi amphictionique de 380 av. J.-C.* (Rev. Arch., June); H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson, *Nummus* (Am. Jour. Philol., July); E. F. D'Arms, *The Date and Nature of the Lex Thoria*

(*ibid.*); J. A. O. Larsen, *Was Greece Free between 196 and 146 B. C.* (Class. Philol., July); L. Laffranchi, *Nuovi testi numismatici sulle vittorie romane nel Ponto* (Historia, IX, no. 1); Germain de Montauzan, *Licinus, procurator des Gaules: L'histoire et la légende* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); T. Corbishley, *The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great* (Jour. Theol. Stud., CXLI); J. Bérard, *Recherches sur les itinéraires de Saint Paul en Asie Mineure* (Rev. Arch., Mar.); J. Gagé, *Un manifeste dynastique de Caligula* (Rev. Études Anc., June); O. Montevecchi, *Ricerche di sociologia nei documenti dell'Egitto greco-romano* (Aegyptus, Apr.); S. Avogadro, *Le* apographai *di proprieta nell' Egitto greco-romano* (*ibid.*); M. Rostovtzeff, *Progonoi* (Jour. Hell. Stud., LV, no. 1); A. Schenk Graf Stauffenberg, *Germanen in römischen Reich* (Welt als Geschichte, I, no. 2); C. A. Balducci, *L'opposizione dinasto-politica alla morte di Onorio* (Riv. Filol., June).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Albert Vogt, *Chronique de l'histoire de Byzance* (Rev. Ques. Hist., May).

A new volume of the Records of Civilization, published under the auspices of the department of history of Columbia University is *Gulathingslög hin eldri, the Earliest Norwegian Laws: being the Gulathing Law and the Frostathing Law* (pp. ix, 351, $5.00), translated from the old Norwegian by Laurence M. Larson. These laws appear to have taken form as early as the reign of the missionary king, Olaf Haraldsson (1016–1030), and present a picture of Norwegian life in the eleventh century as well as illustrate what happened when the Christian religious system was superimposed upon the native culture.

Sune Lindquist's recent publication, *Svenskarne i heden tid* (Stockholm, Bonnier, 1935), is a study of life and culture in Old Sweden, but principally in the viking age. The discussion throughout is topical, though care is also taken to indicate clearly the more important chronological landmarks.

Apropos of the eight hundredth anniversary of a great figure in the history of the Jewish people Professor Solomon Zeitlin has prepared a new biography of *Maimonides* (Bloch Publishing Company, 1935, pp. xi, 234, $2.00).

Professor Alain de Boüard, of the École des chartes, has edited a second volume of *Documents en français des Archives angevines, Règne de Charles Ier: Les comptes des trésoriers* (Boccard, 30 fr.). It will be recalled that the first volume offered *Les mandements aux trésoriers.*

A document of special importance for the history of the medieval German merchant is *Das Handlungsbuch der Holtschuber in Nürnberg von 1304–1307* [Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für fränkische Geschichte]

(Erlangen, Palm and Enke, 1934, pp. lxxxiii, 162, 14.50 M.), edited by Anton Chroust and Hans Proesler. The main part of the account book runs from the spring of 1304 to the spring of 1305. The Holtschuber were cloth merchants.

The volume entitled *L'avènement du régime démocratique à Bruxelles pendant le Moyen Age, 1306–1423,* by F. Favresse, docteur en philosophie et lettres (Brussels, Maurice Lamertin, 1932, pp. 334), is a valuable supplement to the late Professor Des Marez's *L'organisation du travail à Bruxelles au XV^e siècle* (1904). The crafts of Brussels possessed no political rights before 1302, nor might they take any initiative in matters connected with their calling. In 1303, following the rising of their unfortunate fellow laborers in the towns of Flanders who in 1302 defeated their political and social oppressors under the walls of Courtrai, they forced the duke of Brabant and his patrician supporters in Brussels to grant them freedom of corporate action. When the storm passed, in 1306, their liberties were taken from them and until 1423 they were to remain in this submerged social, political, and economic condition, exploited by their more fortunate superiors. This study presents a clear and detailed picture of the inner economic and political organization of a late medieval town. It is provided with a good bibliography and ample notes, besides some unpublished documents. It is to be hoped that such an excellent presentation will make clear to students that medieval Brussels, like other towns of Brabant with which the author frequently compares conditions in Brussels, was an important town well worthy of the historian's attention. H. S. L.

Articles: Ernest Stein, *La Période Byzantine de la Papauté* (Catholic Hist. Rev., July); Percy Ernst Schramm, *Zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Tiara* (Hist. Zeitsch., July); Hildegard Schaeder, *Geschichte und Legende im Werk der Slavenmissionare Konstantin und Method* (*ibid.,* July); Alexander Brückner, *Cyrill und Method* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., V, no. 2); Robert Stupperich, *Zur neueren Nikon-Forschung* (*ibid.*); M. L. W. Laistner, *The Christian Attitude to Pagan Literature* [Historical Revision, LXXIII] (History, June); A. Mollard, *La diffusion de l'Institution oratoire au XII^e siècle* (Moyen Age, Jan.); H. Pflaum, *A Strange Crusaders' Song* (Speculum, July); L. W. Jones, *Two Salzburg Manuscripts and the Influence of Tours* (*ibid.*); Sidney Painter, *English Castles in the Middle Ages* (*ibid.*); J. C. Russell, *Medical Writers of Thirteenth Century England* (An. Medical Hist., July); S. H. F. Johnston, *The Lands of Hubert de Burgh* (Eng. Hist. Rev., July); C. R. Cheney, *Legislation of the Medieval Church* [II] (*ibid.*); M. D. Knowles, *The Revolt of the Lay Brothers of Sempringham* (*ibid.*); H. F. Chettle, *The Burgesses of Calais* (*ibid.*); Paul Rolland, *De l'économie antique au grand commerce médiéval: Le problème de la continuité à Tournai et dans la Gaule du Nord* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., May); A. Jourdan, *La ville*

étudiée dans ses quartiers: Autour des Halles de Paris au moyen âge (*ibid.*); Francis A. Mullin, *The Palatinate of Durham* (Cath. Hist. Rev., July); E. Druwé, *La première rédaction du "Cur Deus homo" de S. Anselme* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., July); Johan Schreiner, *Norges overgang fra arverike til valgrike* [the transition in Norway from a hereditary to an elective monarchy] (Hist. Tidsskr., 1935, no. 2); Absalon Taranger, *Om kongevalg i Norge i sagatiden* [royal elections in Norway in the saga period] (*ibid.*, 1935, nos. 1, 2); Sven Tunberg, *Den äldsta riksgränsen mellan Sverige och Danmark* [the oldest boundary between Sweden and Denmark] (Nordisk Tidskr., 1935, no. 4); G. Wrangel, *Skandinaviska förbindelser med de västslaviska folken under den äldre medeltiden* [Scandinavian contacts with the West Slavic peoples in the earlier Middle Ages] (Tidskr. för Konstvetenskap, 1935); E. F. Jacob, *Dietrich of Niem: His Place in the Conciliar Movement* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); Pauline Aiken, *Vincent of Beauvais and Dame Pertelote's Medicine* (Speculum, July); A. M. and P. Bonenfant, *Le projet d'érection des États bourguignons en royaume en 1447* (Moyen Age, Jan.).

FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

General review: L. Cahen, *L'histoire politique de l'Angleterre aux XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles* (Rev. Synthèse, June).

Students of history will find useful "Recent Literature of the English Renaissance", compiled by Hardin Craig and David Patrick, which constitutes a substantial portion of *Studies in Philology* for April, 1935. One of its eight sections is allotted to titles dealing with "History, Manners, and Customs".

No. 1 of the Monographs in Church History, published by the American Society of Church History, is *Bibliography of the Continental Reformation: Materials available in English*, prepared by Professor Roland H. Bainton, of Yale University.

The origins of capitalistic accumulations receive some illumination from a co-operative work by Hugo Rachel, Johannes Papritz, and Paul Wallich entitled *Berliner Grosskaufleute und Kapitalisten*, vol. I (Berlin, Gsellius, 1934). This is one of the projects of the Verein für die Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg. The first volume goes to the close of the Thirty Years' War. Rachel is the author of a recent work on *Das berliner Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Frühkapitalismus*.

Abbot Johannes Burchard, a personage of importance in the study of the Catholic restoration in Germany during the last half of the sixteenth century, is studied in Salesius Hess's *Das Kloster Banz in seinen Beziehungen zu den Hochstiften Bamberg und Würzburg unter Abt Johannes Burchard: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der fränkischen Benediktinerklöster*. It belongs to

Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benedicktinerordens und seiner Zweige (St. Ottilien, Missionsdruckerei, 1935).

One of the earliest of the great British commercial companies is the subject of a careful study by Alfred C. Wood in *A History of the Levant Company* (Oxford University Press).

Articles: David B. Quinn, *Edward IV and Exploration* (Mariner's Mirror, July); Hans Baron, *La rinascita dell' etica statale Romana nell' Umanesimo Fiorentino del Quattrocento* (Civiltà Moderna, Jan.); Rachel Giese, *Erasmus and the Fine Arts* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); John Horsch, *The Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists of Münster* (Mennonite Quar., Apr.); Rosario Russo, *La politica agraria dell' Officio di San Giorgeo nella Corsica, 1490–1553* (Riv. Stor. Ital., 1934, no. 4); A. Pascal, *Da Lucca a Ginevra: Studi sulla emigrazione religiosa lucchese nel secolo XVI* [IV] (*ibid.*); A. J. Grant, *Ariosto* (History, June); Roberto Davidsohn, *L'avo di Niccolò Machiavelli: Cronista fiorentino* (Arch. Stor. Ital., 1935, no. 1); Giovanni Sforza, *Reflessi della Controriforma nella Repubblica de Venezia* (*ibid.*); Georg Schurhammer, *Die Bekehrung der Paraver, 1535–1537* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu, July); G. Constant, *Le changement doctrinal dans l'Église anglicane sous Édouard VI, 1547–1553* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., July); Henry Guppy, *Miles Coverdale and the English Bible, 1488–1568* (Bull. John Rylands Library, July); Charles Borgeaud, *Le "vrai portrait" de John Knox* (Bull. Hist. Protestantisme Fr., Jan.); Andre É. Sayous, *Calvinisme et capitalisme: L'expérience genevoise* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., May); A. Dupront, *D'un "humanisme chrétien" en Italie à la fin du XVI^e siècle* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); Karl Völker, *Die Glaubensfreiheit in den Städten Polens* (Zeitsch. Osteur. Gesch., V, no. 1).

SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

General review: F. R. Radice, *The Reign of Queen Anne* (History, June).

A significant phase of the history of Charles I is thoroughly explored in *Charles I and the Court of Rome* (Burns, Oates), by Gordon Albion.

The attitude of the Swedish church toward certain strivings in the decade of the 1630's after greater unity in the Protestant world has been made the subject of a penetrating study by Gunnar Westin which has been published under the title *Svenska kyrkan och de protestantiska enhetssträvendena under 1630-talet* (Uppsala, *1934*, pp. 332). The work is concerned largely with the activities of the Scottish theologian John Durie (Duræus) who spent some time in Sweden in that decade promoting a propaganda which, however, bore little fruit.

Cort Adeler (Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1934), by Preben Holck, is a

detailed account of a notable career in the naval history of the North. Cort Adeler was born in Norway and died (1675) as admiral of the Danish navy. He had also seen long service on the decks of Holland and Venice, and had therefore shared in many important events, all of which the author discusses on somewhat broader lines than is customary in a biographical work.

Cassell has added another volume to the series of selections from the letters and papers of British monarchs: *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne,* edited by Beatrice Curtis Brown.

Christopher Hobhouse in his vigorously written *Fox* (Houghton Mifflin) disagrees in a variety of particulars with the conventional histories of England in the period of the American and French Revolutions. But his book totally wants the apparatus of scholarship, and readers versed in the sources will not always agree with his interpretations. Consequently his book would not seem to supply the need for a life of Fox.

The second volume of Holger Hjelholt's history of Falster (*Falsters Historie,* II, Copenhagen, Gad, 1935), carries the narrative forward to 1800. In addition to making a notable contribution to Danish local history, the author has been able to add materially to the available knowledge of the social history of the Danish kingdom. It is understood that the work will have no continuation.

The Torrington Diaries (Eyre and Spottiswoode) are continued in two volumes, vol. II covering the years 1781 to 1794, and a small supplementary volume, embodying a manuscript discovered too late for inclusion in vol. II. The latter is entitled *Clouds and Sunshine, by an English Tourist of the Eighteenth Century* (R. P. Smith). This is the first part of the "Tour of 1789". The editor of both volumes is C. Bruyn Andrews.

Methodism and Politics, 1791–1851 (Cambridge University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. x, 226, $2.50), by E. R. Taylor, is the Thirlwall and Gladstone Prize Essay for 1933. As an undergraduate essay this little volume is praiseworthy and meritorious. The author selected a good subject, read in appropriate places, and writes with no more than the usual dogmatism and superficiality of youth. It is unfortunate that such an essay should appear as a book. Unwary readers, not understanding the circumstances under which the author wrote, may be misled.

The first number of the new series of *La Révolution française,* issued under the auspices of the Centre d'Études de la Révolution française, has the subtitle of *Revue d'histoire contemporaine.* This indicates, as Professor Sagnac, one of the three directors, remarks in his foreword, that the review is to take as its field modern history from the eighteenth century, although the history of the French Revolution is still to retain the place of honor. The scope is also suggested by the fact that an article soon to be published

will treat the historiography of the American Revolution for the years 1924–1934. More space is also to be given to the publication of documents, and the initial number contains the first installment of the letters of Bishop Grégoire to one of his intimate friends. The magazine receives a new and attractive format. The publishers are the Recueil Sirey.

The same Centre d'Études has published a third volume of its *Cahiers*. This includes "La doctrine coloniale de la France en 1789", by Gaston Martin, and "Les colonies pendant la Révolution", by Paul Roussier (Recueil Sirey, 10 fr.).

An important contribution, long awaited with interest, dealing with one of the most vexing problems of the French Revolution, is *Les Massacres de Septembre* (Maison du Livre Français, 1935, pp. xlix, 559, 80 fr.), by Pierre Caron, the distinguished archivist. Here the sources of information are subjected to the tests which the experienced critic is accustomed to employ in less controversial cases.

The second volume of the *Korrespondenz des Peter Ochs* [Quellen zur schweizer Geschichte] (Basel, Emil Birkhaüser, 1935), edited by Gustav Steiner, covers the years from the Peace of Basel to the Helvetic Revolution, 1796 to 1799. It makes substantial additions to the material already known. The notes of the editor are full and enlightening.

An important source for Danish and more particularly for German history in the strenuous generation that is now coming to a close is being provided by H. P. Hanssen whose published memoirs have now reached the fourth volume. The author was for a period of twenty-three years the representative, first in the *Landtag* and later in the *Reichstag*, of the Danish-speaking element in Slesvig. The current volume of the memoirs closes with the fateful year 1914. (*Et Tilbageblik*, IV, 1912–1914, Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1934.)

Articles: F. Bourcier, *Le régime municipal à Dijon sous Henry IV* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Mar.); J. G. Van Dillen, *Isaac Le Maire et le commerce des actions de la Compagnie des Indes orientales* [concl'd] (*ibid.*); Wilhelm Kratz, *Der Prozess Malagrida nach den Originalakten der Inquisition im Torre do Tombo in Lissabon* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu, Jan.); Sebastianus Tromp, *Auctuarii auctaria, II: Addenda quaedam ad auctarium Bellarminianum* (*ibid.*, July); A. F. Pollard, *Hayward Townshend's Journals: II, the 'Historical Collections' and D'Ewes' Journals* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, June); Léon Vignols, *Une question mal posée: Le travail manuel des Blancs et des esclaves aux Antilles* [XVII^{e}-XVIII^{e} siècles] (Rev. Hist., Mar.); J. Milton French, *Milton as a Historian* (Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc., June); Roswell G. Ham, *Dryden as Historiographer-Royal* (Rev. Eng. Stud., July); Harold Williams, *Jonathan Swift and the Four Last Years of the Queen*

(Library, June); Norman Sykes, *Queen Anne and the Episcopate* (Eng. Hist. Rev., July); Judith Blow Williams, *The Development of British Trade with West Africa, 1750–1850* (Pol. Sci. Quar., June); Friedrich Meinecke, *Die englische Präromantik des 18. Jahrhunderts als Vorstufe des Historismus* (Hist. Zeitsch., July); L. de Cardenal, *La liquidation des impôts directs de l'ancien régime, exercises 1788–1789* (Rév. Fr., Oct. [1934]); Edmond Soreau, *Note sur le travail des enfants dans l'industrie pendant la Révolution* (Rev. Études Hist., Apr.); Georges Goyau, *L'évêque François Picquet dans Ispahan* (*ibid.*); C. Bouglé, *Proudhon et la Révolution française* (Rév. Fr., 1935, no. 1); L. Gaudel, *Hérault de Séchelles* (*ibid.*); Sainte Claire Deville, *La Commune de l'an II* (Rev. Ques. Hist., May).

HISTORY SINCE 1800

General review: Georges Bourgin, *Histoire contemporaine d'Italie* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); Justus Hashagen, *Zum Schrifttum des Weltkrieges* (Berl. Monatsh., June); Bruce T. McCully, *The Origins of Indian Nationalism according to Native Writers* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.).

Dr. Alfred von Wegerer has constructed an admirable instrument for the use of those working in the field of World War origins, a *Bibliographie zur Vorgeschichte des Weltkrieges* (Berlin, Quaderverlag, 1934, pp. 129, 4 M.). It lists documentary collections, memoirs, biographies, and collections of letters. These are arranged under the heading of the several states concerned. One notes with some surprise that the longest of these state lists is the Russian. That of Germany stands second. A particularly valuable section in the several lists is "Aus Zeitschriften", which embodies references to recollections printed in newspapers and periodicals. The editor regards the task of listing the generality of books and articles on the origins of the war as impracticable, if not useless, but in an "Anhang" he has given the titles of those which he regards as outstanding. These are listed alphabetically by authors. There is an index of names of persons, identifying all those mentioned. The editor has thoughtfully included seven blank pages, in order that the users of his bibliography may add titles as new volumes appear.

No. 2 of the Bibliographical Series of the Hoover War Library is *An Introduction to a Bibliography of the Paris Peace Conference: Collections of Sources, Archive Publications, and Source Books* (Stanford University Press, 1935, pp. 32). It is compiled by Nina Almond and Ralph Haswell Lutz. They have added an index.

Koppel S. Pinson has prepared *A Bibliographical Introduction to Nationalism* (Columbia University Press, 1935, pp. 71, 75 cents). It is provided with an index. Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes has written a foreword.

Those who have found both instruction and delight in the late Pierre de La Gorce's historical works, especially on the Second Empire, will be glad that he requested the publication of his most recent articles. The result is a collection of essays entitled *Au temps du Second Empire* (Plon, 1935, pp. iv, 245, 15 fr.). The leading essay is a remarkable study of Thiers, which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* a year ago. Another of great interest is on "Le Barreau sous le Second Empire". These are followed by "Ceux qui ne gouvernent pas" and "Le cardinal Régnier".

Professor Heinrich Friedjung's *The Struggle for Supremacy in Germany, 1859–1866,* translated by A. J. P. Taylor and W. L. McElwee [Studies in Modern History, General Editor, L. B. Namier] (Macmillan, 1935, pp. xxxi, 339, $5.75), reduces the eleven hundred pages of the original to three hundred by the omission of nearly all of the details of military operations and most of the appendixes, and by the skillful condensation of many other paragraphs. The translators have added a few supplementary notes based chiefly on the studies of Engel-Janosi and of Redlich and on their own investigations in the Austrian archives. There are no references, however, to the new documentary collections nor to Clark's important *Franz Joseph and Bismarck before 1866.* In spite of these gaps, the volume gives the essentials of Friedjung's account of the political and diplomatic transactions and is a welcome addition to the scanty list of good books on German and Austrian history available for the general reader. L. D. S.

The second volume of the British *History of the Great War: Military Operations, Macedonia* (H. M. Stationery Office, 12*s.* 6*d.*, maps, 5*s.* 6*d.*) covers the period of the Balkan struggle from the spring of 1917 to the close of the war. Like its predecessor it is edited by Captain Cyril Falls.

"There is nothing so tedious as a twice told tale." Well, that depends on who tells it. In the hands of a crisp, incisive French writer such as Maurice Paléologue the very familiar story of the personal friendship and diplomatic rivalry of the last Russian Czar and the last German Kaiser, *Guillaume II et Nicolas II* (Plon, 1934, pp. 249, 12 fr.) takes on a new freshness. The contrast of characters is brilliant and, in the main, fair to both unhappy monarchs: Wilhelm, restless, ambitious, dramatic, able, erratic, self-hypnotized, playing the part of a rather condescending big brother to the dull, shy, uncertain, superstitious Russian ruler. Both started under the handicap of an inferiority complex, but "Willy" escaped from it and swung too far in the opposite direction ("overcompensation"), while "Nicky" to the end remained within its shadow. Points of special interest in the work are the comments on the influence of the two empresses; the account of the Kaiser's amazing efforts to embroil Russia and Great Britain during the Russo-Japanese War, by encouraging the Czar to make hostile demonstrations on the Indian frontier (p. 109) or even seize Constantinople (p. 111); the emphasis on the too

much neglected episode in 1914 when the Czar proposed to lay the whole Austro-Serbian quarrel before The Hague Tribunal, a proposal contemptuously rejected by the Wilhelmstrasse (pp. 191–194); and the long and bitter arraignment of the Kaiser for not exerting himself to stipulate for the life of his former friend at the Brest-Litovsk negotiations (pp. 227–242), perhaps too bitter, for war is usually considered to cancel old friendships. P. S.

Articles: Ernesto Pontieri, *Carlo Felice al governo della Sardegna, 1799–1806* [I]: *La figura del duca del Genevese, vicerè in Sardegna* (Arch. Stor. Ital. 1935, no. 1); Félix Ponteil, *La contrebande sur le Rhin au temps de Premier Empire* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); T. R. Schellenberg, *The Secret Treaty of Verona: a Newspaper Forgery* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); Bishop C. Hunt, *The Joint Stock Company in England, 1830–1844* (Jour. Pol. Ec., June); Philip M. Hamer, *British Consuls and the Negro Seamen Acts, 1850–1860* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Marquis d'Aragon, *Monseigneur Strossmayer, précurseur de l'unité yougo-slave* (Rev. Ques. Hist., May); Ernst Schüle, *Die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858–1871: zur Aktenveröffentlichung der Historischen Reichskommission* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., V, no. 2); A. S. Kenyon, *The Royal Mint and its Australian Branches* (Victorian Hist. Mag., May); G. A. Ballard, *The Unarmoured Branches of the British Navy of 1875* (Mariner's Mirror, July); Freiherr v. Freyberg-Eisenberg, *Maurice de Bunsen* (Berl. Monatsh., June); Howard M. Ehrmann, *Triple Alliance and Triple Entente* (*ibid.*, Aug.); Ferdinand Friedensburg, *Hat Deutschland den Weltkrieg durch unverhältnismässige Rohstoffeinfuhr vorbereitet* (*ibid.*); P. E. Bordeau, *La mort du roi Georges I^er^, Salonique, 18 mars, 1913: Notes et souvenirs* (Rev. Études Hist., Apr.); W. Kokovtzoff, *La mission Liman von Sanders: Les entretiens de Berlin en novembre, 1913* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Apr.); Albert Pingaud, *L'intervention de la Roumanie dans la guerre européenne* (*ibid.*); Ernst Buchfinck, *Der Meinungskampf um den Marnefeldzug* (Hist. Zeitsch., July); Robert C. Binkley, *Versailles to Stresa* (Virginia Quar. Rev., July); Oscar Jászi, *Czechoslovakia's First Years* (Yale Rev., summer).

Documents: Minna R. Falk, ed., *A Letter of Richard Cobden to Alexander Bach* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Sept.); Charles Chesnelong, ed., *Correspondance inédite de Charles Chesnelong, 1861–1866* (Rev. Ques. Hist., May); *La crise de juillet 1914: Documents saxons* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Apr.).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: orderly book kept by a provincial officer in the forces of General Amherst, at Lake George, July 27–August 4,

1759; transcripts of the correspondence between the British minister to the United States and the British foreign secretary, 1791–1806; 24 papers relating to Junius Brutus Booth and his family, 1817–1891; address of Daniel Putnam, vindicating the character and conduct of Israel Putnam, June 12, 1818; 65 papers of W. H. D. C. Wright, United States consul at Rio de Janeiro, 1819–1843; letter book of Joseph R. Chandler, M. C., 1850–1851; four scrapbooks of newspaper clippings, etc., relating to Jeremiah S. Black, 1857–1900; papers of Brigadier General Edward S. Godfrey, 1865–1933, relating to the battle of the Little Big Horn; papers of James G. Blaine, several thousand; and papers of Evelyn B. Baldwin.

In the organization of the National Archives the following appointments have been made by the President and confirmed by the Senate: Mr. Dorsey W. Hyde, as Director of Archival Service, with general supervision over the professional divisions of the Archives; Dr. Solon J. Buck, as Director of Publications, having general editorial supervision over the publications of the Archives; Mr. Thad S. Page, to be Administrative Secretary; Mr. Collas G. Harris, to be Executive Officer.

The comprehensive survey of the records of the government, in charge of Thomas M. Owen, jr., Chief of the Division of Accessions of the National Archives, is already in progress. Dr. Connor, head of the Archives, has announced the appointment of the following deputy examiners with the departments the papers of which they will survey: Dr. Nelson M. Blake (Navy); Dr. Philip M. Hamer (Interior); Dr. Dallas D. Irvine (War); Mr. Arthur H. Leavitt (Commerce); Dr. Paul Lewinson (Labor); Mr. Frank D. McAlister (Post Office); Dr. Theodore R. Shellenberg (Agriculture); Mr. Fred W. Shipman (State); Mr. Westel R. Willoughby (Treasury). Other appointments announced by the Archivist are: Mr. John G. Bradley, as Chief of the Division of Motion Pictures and Sound Recording; Dr. Percy Scott Flippin, as Chief of the Division of Research; Dr. Nelson Vance Russell, as Chief of the Division of Reference; Dr. Vernon D. Tate, as Chief of the Division of Photographic Reproduction; Mr. Marcus W. Price, as Assistant Director of Archival Service; Mr. James D. Preston, as Assistant Administrative Secretary; Dr. Carl Ludwig Lokke and Dr. Almon R. Wright, as assistants in the Division of Classification; Dr. Philip C. Brooks, Dr. George F. Ashworth, Mr. Emmet J. Leahy, and Dr. Benjamin H. Goode, as special examiners of such records as have been recommended by the several departments to Congress for destruction as useless papers, but which may possess sufficient historical interest to justify their deposit in the Archives.

Among the accessions to the Naval Historical Foundation made in 1934 the following may be noted: 39 letters, 1839–1844, by Midshipman George Harrison; 150 letters, documents, and pamphlets, 1844–1890—an addition to the Rear Admiral T. O. Selfridge collection; several letters, documents,

and photographs, 1870–1877, Rear Admiral J. L. Worden; Josiah Fox papers, 1795–1810; photographs and letters, and a copy of the log of the U. S. S. *Wateree,* 1868, Rear Admiral Edward D. Taussig; account of the fight between the *Sassacus* and the *Albemarle,* May 5, 1864, by Rear Admiral F. A. Roe; logbook of the U. S. S. *Lexington,* 1851–1852; original Sampson telegram, battle of Santiago, 1898; copies of eight letters of Commodore William Bainbridge, 1804–1825; George C. Ames collection of prints, photographs, and books. C. O. P.

The William L. Clements Library has issued a guide, beautifully printed in the style of the time, to an exhibition commemorating the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the first English attempt to settle within the limits of the present United States. It is entitled *A brief account of Ralegh's Roanoke Colony of 1585.* The special treasure of the exhibition is the De Bry engravings from John White's paintings. The late Mr. Clements was an "ardent collector of De Bry" with the result that the Library "possesses seventeen different editions, issues, and variants" of the De Bry-Hariot *Virginia.* The guide of the exhibition is appropriately dedicated to the "Adventurers and Favourers of the book-collecting game".

The joint committee of the American Council on Education and of the Social Science Research Council has issued the first of a series of reports on "Administrative Phases of State Educational Systems" under the title of *The American State and Higher Education: the Legal and Constitutional Relationships* (Washington, American Council on Education, 1935, pp. vii, 251). The author is Alexander Brody, LL.M., Ph.D., of St. John's University, Brooklyn.

As Professor Carter Goodrich has explained in the preface, the report entitled *Internal Migration in the United States* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934, pp. x, 52, $1.00), by C. Warren Thornthwaite, assisted by Helen I. Slentz, was undertaken "in the hope of discovering bases for the determination of public policy". The authors do not pretend to have attained the goal and yet they have succeeded in assembling and recording upon well-designed maps the important results of their inquiries. The close of an era in which ever growing urban centers like New York seemed characteristic gives rise to the anxious question where all these multitudes can go. It is reassuring to learn that since 1930 there has been a net movement back to the farm. This work has been followed by two others: *Migration and Planes of Living, 1920–1934* (1935, pp. viii, 111, $1.00), by Carter Goodrich, Bushrod W. Allin, and Marion Hayes, and *Is Industry decentralizing?* (pp. viii, 105, $1.00), by Daniel B. Creamer.

The addresses delivered on April 20, 1934, at the University of Chicago on the occasion of the acquisition by the university of the William E. Barton Library of Lincolniana have been published in a small volume entitled

Had Lincoln Lived (University of Chicago Press, 1934, pp. vii, 62, $1.00). They include an address by William E. Dodd on "Lincoln's Dilemma".

A revised edition has been published of Professor Herbert Eugene Bolton's syllabus (with maps) entitled *History of the Americas* (Ginn, 1935, pp. xvi, 365, $2.40).

Ulysses S. Grant, the Great Soldier of America, by Robert R. McCormick (D. Appleton-Century, 1934, pp. xviii, 343, $5.00), is the fifth book in seven years written particularly to enhance the military reputation of General Grant. Woodward's *Meet General Grant* (1928) was followed by Conger's *Rise of General Grant* (1931) and by Fuller's two volumes, *The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant* (1929) and *Grant and Lee* (1933). Colonel McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago *Tribune,* has produced an interesting volume with very good battle accounts, the clearness of which is increased by the numerous excellent maps. He has pushed his thesis too hard, however, in trying to prove his national, and even international, superlatives for Grant's generalship. He even attempts to explain away Cold Harbor. He advances the interesting view that the diminution of Grant's reputation was a deliberate conspiracy of the liberals, who emphasized Lincoln, and the aristocrats, who eulogized Lee. The book, therefore, is to be recommended for its narrative and maps, but it is not thoroughly convincing in its special pleading. It is probable that the combined impact of all this effort to increase Grant's reputation will eventually bear fruit but Grant still awaits a thorough and definitive biography comparable to Freeman's recent volumes on Lee. R. G. A.

Articles: Lawrence H. Gipson, *Charles McLean Andrews and the Re-Orientation of American Colonial Historiography* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); Jarvis M. Morse, *John Smith and his Critics: a Chapter in Colonial Historiography* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Bibliographical Studies in Early Polish Americana* [III]: *Bielski's Chronicle* (Bull. New York Public Library, May); Guiraud, *Les origines de la "Course des bois"* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Mar.); V. Alton Moody, *Early Religious Efforts in the Lower Mississippi Valley* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Sept.); J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, *The Passing of the Constitution* (Virginia Quar. Rev., July); Edgar Erskine Hume, *La Fayette in Kentucky* [cont'd] (Kentucky State Hist. Reg., July); Burton J. Hendrick, *America's First Ambassador* (Atlantic, Aug., Sept.); Josephine Fisher, *Francis James Jackson and Newspaper Propaganda in the United States, 1809–1810* (Maryland Hist. Mag., June); Philip Auchampaugh, *A Forgotten Journey of an Ante-Bellum President: the Trip and Addresses of James Buchanan delivered during his Journey to the Commencement of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1859* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); Hambleton Tapp, *The Battle of Perryville, 1862* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., July); Carter Goodrich and Sol Davison, *The Wage-Earner in the Westward Move-*

ment [I] (Pol. Sci. Quar., June); William B. Hesseltine, *Economic Factors in the Abandonment of Reconstruction* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Sept.); Fred H. Harrington, *The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898–1900* (*ibid.*); E. Merton Coulter, *The Attempt of William Howard Taft to Break the Solid South* (Georgia Hist. Quar., June).

Documents: Victor Hugo Paltsits, ed., *Journal of Benjamin Mifflin on a Tour from Philadelphia to Delaware and Maryland, July 26 to August 14, 1762* (Bull. New York Public Library, June); Mary S. Estill, ed., *Diary of a Confederate Congressman, 1862–1863* [II] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., July); James Bennett McCreary, *The Journal of my Soldier Life* [C. S. A., II] (Kentucky State Hist. Reg., July); Otto H. Rothert, ed., *Letter of William J. Davis of Morgan's Cavalry, 1863* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., July); Winfred A. Harbison, ed., *Zachariah Chandler's Part in the Reëlection of Abraham Lincoln* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Sept.).

NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

During the year 1936 the Massachusetts Historical Society plans to publish the *General Index to Proceedings,* Volumes XLI-LX, prepared by Mr. D. M. Matteson; Volume V of Sibley's *Lives of Harvard Graduates* (*1701–1712*), making the second volume prepared by Dr. Clifford K. Shipton, in the continuing series which the society is issuing; Volume LXV of *Proceedings* (1932–1934); and Volume III of the *Winthrop Papers* (*1631–1634*). Volume XVI of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts* (*1738–1739*) will appear late this year, and Volume XVII in 1936.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has decided to issue a second series of Photostats Americana, modeled on the plan and method according to which Dr. Worthington C. Ford, editor emeritus, issued the first series during the years 1919–1930. The important work on colonial newspapers continues: during the past year two volumes of the *Virginia Gazette* have been delivered to twenty-five subscribers, and a second volume of the Boston *Gazette* (1726–1729) has been sent out to twenty subscribers.

Among the manuscript acquisitions of the Massachusetts Historical Society are: The Harrison Gray Otis papers; various papers of the Winslow family, containing much information about the prerevolutionary commerce of Boston and about the tribulations of the Loyalists; the Isaac Smith family papers; the diary of Increase Mather for the year 1681; various letters of Henry Barnes, prominent Massachusetts Loyalist; and the accounts of Jeremiah Allen, treasurer of the province of Massacusetts Bay for the years 1714–1716. A considerable number of rare items also have been added to the library. S. M.

The chief paper in the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society

for October, 1933 [published, 1934], is one by Dr. R. D. W. Connor on "William Gaston, a Southern Federalist of the Old School and his Yankee Friends, 1778–1844", based on Gaston's papers; in the issue for April, 1934 [published, 1935], one by Mr. Henry R. Wagner on the Mexican historian, Joaquin García Icazbalceta, and his works.

Among the papers recently presented to the Connecticut Historical Society is a collection from the Gilmans of Norwich, including a series of letters from Daniel Wadsworth Coit, 1805–1852, Samuel Hubbard, 1822–1843, letter books of Daniel Lathrop Coit, and letters of Daniel Coit Gilman while in St. Petersburg in 1854.

Of special value to social history is George Arthur Dunlap's *The City in the American Novel, 1789–1900: a Study of American Novels portraying Contemporary Conditions in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934, pp. 187, $1.00).

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has acquired an extensive body of papers (some 16,000 pieces) pertaining principally to the mercantile interests of the Coates and Reynell families in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but including also numerous papers relating to Indian affairs, 1759–1763, and to the Dismal Swamp lands and the Marlboro Iron Works of Colonel Isaac Zane.

Many interesting phases of municipal development are touched in *The History of an Old Philadelphia Land Title: 208 South Fourth Street* (privately printed, 1934, pp. xv, 273), the manuscript of which was nearly completed at the death of the author, John Frederick Lewis. The record is brought down to the time of Joseph Morgan Pile who died in 1899.

Crime and its Punishment in Pennsylvania, by Professor Lawrence H. Gipson, is No. 15 in "Studies in the Humanities", published by Lehigh University.

Articles: Edward Midwinter, *The S. P. G. and the Church in the American Colonies: New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts* (Hist. Mag. Protestant Episcopal Church, June); Edwin B. Hewes, *Thomas Handasyd Perkins: Supercargo of the Astrea of Salem* (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., July); Gerald S. Graham, *The Nantucket Whale Fishery* (New Eng. Quar., June); B. J. Loewenberg, *Evolution in New England* (*ibid.*); Francis Parsons, *A Yale Man in Nelson's England* [Benjamin Silliman] (Queen's Quarterly, summer); W. L. Calver, *Military Buttons in the Fort Ticonderoga Collection* (Bull. Fort Ticonderoga Museum, July); Henry Allain St. Paul, *Governor Thomas Dongan's Expansion Policy* [I] (Mid-America, July); William J. Hoffman, *An Armory of American Families of Dutch Descent* (New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec., July); Frederick K. Zercher, *The Port of Oswego*

(New York History, July); W. Freeman Galpin, *Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Gerrit Smith* (*ibid.*); Hugh M. Flick, *The Great Blizzard and the Blizzard Men of 1888* (New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull., July); Grace D. Rose, *Early Morristown Imprints* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., July); Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Washington's Training School for the Revolution* (*ibid.*); Henry P. Beers, compiler, *Pennsylvania Bibliographies* (Pennsylvania Hist., July); A. D. Chidsey, jr., *Easton before the French and Indian War* (*ibid.*); Elizabeth H. Buck, *Social Life in Western Pennsylvania as seen by Early Travelers* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., June); Lily Lee Nixon, *Colonel James Burd in the Campaign of 1759* (*ibid.*); Hazel S. Garrison, *Cartography of Pennsylvania before 1800* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); Jeannette P. Nichols, *Pennsylvania and the Agitation for Cheap Money* (*ibid.*).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Professor Marcus M. Wilkerson's *Thomas Duckett Boyd* (Louisiana State University Press, 1935, pp. 374) is described in the subtitle as *The Story of a Southern Educator,* but it is also a contribution to the history of higher education in Louisiana. Thomas Boyd's brother David was a teacher in that Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy of which William Tecumseh Sherman was once superintendent, and which developed into the State University. Thomas himself was a graduate of the university, a teacher there, and president of the State Normal School before he began in 1896 his thirty years' service as president of the university. The biography is based upon President Boyd's papers, supplemented by other documents, newspaper files, and recollections of colleagues.

Articles: Clement Eaton, *The South and Northern Radicalism* (New Eng. Quar., June); Matthew Page Andrews, *Separation of Church and State in Maryland* (Catholic Hist. Rev., July); James E. Hancock, *The Baltimore Clipper and the Story of an Old Baltimore Shipbuilder* [Joseph Despeaux] (Maryland Hist. Mag., June); George C. Keidel, compiler, *Early Maryland Newspapers* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); George C. Gregory, *Jamestown: The First Brick State House* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); *Edmund Randolph's Essay on the Revolutionary History of Virginia, 1774–1782* (*ibid.*); H. L. Ganter, *Some Notes on "The Charity of the Honourable Robert Boyle"* [II] (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., July); A. B. Cutts, *Educational Influence of Aberdeen in 17th Century Virginia* (*ibid.*); E. E. Hume, *Light-Horse Harry and his Fellow Members of the Cincinnati* (*ibid.*); C. O. Paullin, *Mark Twain's Virginia Kin* (*ibid.*); William A. Russ, jr., *Disfranchisement in Virginia under Radical Reconstruction* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); Justin Williams, *English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores, 1705–1776* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Marvin L. Skaggs, *The First Boundary Survey between the Carolinas* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., July); Elizabeth G. McPherson, *Unpublished Letters from North*

Carolinians to Jefferson (*ibid.*); William H. Gehrke, *The Ante-Bellum Agriculture of the Germans in North Carolina* (Agricultural Hist., July); H. M. Douty, *Early Labor Organization in North Carolina* (South Atlantic Quar., July); D. J. Whitener, *The Temperance Movement in North Carolina* (*ibid.*); William E. Heath, *The Early Colonial Money System of Georgia* (Georgia Hist. Quar., June); D. C. Corbitt, *The Establishment of an Early Express from Pensacola to Savannah* (*ibid.*); T. Frederick Davis, *History of Juan Ponce de Leon's Voyages to Florida: Source Records* [monograph] (Florida Hist. Quar., July); Mack Swearingen, *Thirty Years of a Mississippi Plantation: Charles Whitmore of "Montpelier"* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); William A. Russ, jr., *Disfranchisement in Louisiana, 1862–1870* (Louisiana Hist. Quar., July); Max L. Griffin, *A Bibliography of New Orleans Magazines* (*ibid.*); W. Edwin Hemphill, *The Jeffersonian Background of the Louisiana Purchase* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Sept.).

Documents: R. A. Lancaster, jr., ed., *Diary of Colonel William Bolling of Bolling Hall* [1827] (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., July); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Abstracts from the Records of the Court of Ordinary, 1764–1771* (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., July); Elizabeth H. Jervey, ed., *The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768–1775* [cont'd] (*ibid.*, Apr., July); A. S. Salley, ed., *Diary of William Dillwyn during a Visit to Charles Town in 1772* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); E. Wilson Lyon, ed., *Moustier's Memoir on Louisiana* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Sept.); Mattie Austin Hatcher, ed., *Letters of Antonio Martinez, the Last Spanish Governor of Texas, 1817–1822* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., July); M. L. Crimmins, ed., *Colonel Robert E. Lee's Report on Indian Combats in Texas* (*ibid.*).

The Book that gave to Iowa its Name is a reprint of *Notes on the Wisconsin Territory particularly with reference to the Iowa District or Black Hawk Purchase,* by Lieutenant Albert M. Lea, United States Dragoons, and published by H. S. Tanner in Philadelphia in 1836. Dr. B. F. Shambaugh has furnished an editorial "Explanation".

Among the important accessions to the collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin are the papers of Jessie Jack (Mrs. Ben) Hooper, significant for the history of state and national women's organizations, a hitherto missing group of Senator James R. Doolittle's papers, an addition to the Henry Demarest Lloyd papers, and the papers of Theodore Kronshage, for many years president of the Normal School Board, later of the Board of Regents of the University. The society is resuming the work of indexing the United States census for Wisconsin, workers being supplied by the Federal work relief organization. The superintendent has also outlined, for the work relief organization, a plan for invoicing county records in all Wisconsin counties. A sample piece of work along that line has been done on the Dane County records by Miss Alice E. Smith, curator of manuscripts. The Index

to Volumes I to XV of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History,* published recently, is being distributed free to members. To non-members the price is two dollars. J. S.

The July number of *Nebraska History Magazine* is a memorial issue for the brothers Frank and Luther North, frontiersmen and commanders of the Pawnee Scouts. The issue includes letters and reminiscences of Capt. Luther North, military reports and orders, tributes to the two brothers, etc., edited by A. E. Sheldon.

The Five Civilized Tribes (University of Oklahoma Press, 1934, pp. 455, $4.00), by Grant Foreman, is the fifth of the author's volumes on the history of the Old Southwest in the "Civilization of the American Indian Series". It consists of five books dealing separately with the struggles of the Choctaw, Chicasaw, Creek, Seminole, and Cherokee to adjust themselves to their new environment in the lands which had been allotted to them west of the Mississippi. It attempts to show how, in dealing with the social and political problems which confronted them, they earned the name of "The Five Civilized Tribes". Like all the books of the series it contains a mass of facts with no analysis and no connected narrative. J. C. G.

The *Forty-Third Annual Report* of the Hawaiian Historical Society (1934) includes an article by John F. G. Stokes on "Kaoleioku: Paternity and Biographical Sketch".

Articles: Thomas F. O'Connor, *Pierre de Smet: Frontier Missionary* (Mid-America, July); John D. Barnhart, *The Southern Element in the Leadership of the Old Northwest* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Henry G. Rooker, *Nathaniel Cross, the Father of the Tennessee Historical Society* (Tennessee Hist. Mag., Apr.); T. D. Clark, *The Development of the Nashville and Chattanooga* (*ibid.*); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *Books and Pamphlets printed in Chicago, 1835–1850* [II] (Bull. Chicago Hist. Soc., May); Benjamin P. Thomas, *Lincoln's Earlier Practice in the Federal Courts, 1839–1854* (Bull. Abraham Lincoln Assoc., June); Benjamin F. Stickney, *The Ohio-Michigan War* [contest over disputed boundary] (Hist. Soc. Northwestern Ohio Quar. Bull., July); John F. McDermott, *The Exclusive Trade Privilege of Maxent, La Clède, and Company* [1762–1769] (Missouri Hist. Rev., July); Antoine J. Jobin, *The First Frenchmen in Michigan* (Michigan Hist. Mag., spring and summer); George N. Fuller, *Settlement of Southern Michigan* (*ibid.*); Philip D. Jordan, *The Iowa Pioneer Phalanx* (Palimpsest, July); William J. Petersen, *Troops and Military Supplies on Upper Mississippi River Steamboats* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., July); Albert Miller Lea, *Report on the Iowa-Missouri Boundary, January 19, 1839* (*ibid.*); Joseph Schafer, *Sectional and Personal Politics in Early Wisconsin* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., June); Albert H. Sanford, *The Beginnings of a Great Industry at La Crosse* [shingle-making] (*ibid.*); Charles M. Gates, *The Lac*

qui Parle Indian Mission (Minnesota Hist., June); Marie A. Olson, *Swedish Settlement at Stotler* (Kansas Hist. Quar., May); Grant Foreman, *Missionaries of Latter Day Saints of Indian Territory* (Chron. Oklahoma, June); France V. Scholes, *The First Decade of the Inquisition in New Mexico* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., July); R. H. Allen, *The Spanish Land-Grant System as an Influence in the Agricultural Development of California* (Agricultural Hist., July); Leslie M. Scott, *Oregon, Texas, and California, 1846* (Oregon Hist. Quar., June).

Documents: Gilbert J. Garraghan, ed., *Some Newly Discovered Marquette and La Salle Letters* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu, July); Walter N. Sage, ed., *Sitting Bull's own Narrative of the Custer Fight* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June); Robert M. Gatke, ed., *A Document of Mission History, 1833–1843* [concl'd] (Oregon Hist. Quar., June).

CANADA

General review: G. de T. Glazebrook, *Canada and Foreign Affairs* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June).

In the *Report of the Public Archives* of Canada for 1934, by Arthur G. Doughty, former dominion archivist, is included a beautiful reproduction in color of the Vallard Map from the Dieppe Atlas of 1547, now preserved in the Huntington Library. There is also a list of the MSS., books, maps, and pictures which made up the historical exhibit apropos of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of Canada by Jacques Cartier.

The annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association took place at Queen's University, Kingston, on May 27 and 28. Among the papers presented were "The Fenian Troubles and Canadian Military Development, 1865–1871", by C. P. Stacey, of Princeton University, "American Republican Leadership and the Movement for the Annexation of Canada in the 1860's", by J. Patterson Smith, of Illinois College, and "Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester", by A. L. Burt, of the University of Minnesota. Professor E. R. Adair, of McGill University, was elected president of the association.

The Grand Manan Historical Society of Grand Manan Island, New Brunswick, founded in 1931 by Buchanan Charles, of Boston, Mass., published on July 1 a detailed map of Grand Manan, adapted from British and American government charts and the Canadian Geological Survey map. In May, 1934, the society began publication of a magazine named *The Grand Manan Historian,* as a feature of the celebration of the One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the settling of Grand Manan. The first and anniversary number contained a concise account of the settling of the island, a brief biographical sketch of Moses Gerrish, Harvard 1762, leader of the first settlers of Grand Manan, both articles by Mr. Charles, and a description, which had been written by Mr. Gerrish himself, of the state of the island when he and his associates arrived there on Thursday, May 6, 1784.

A biography which throws light on contemporary Canadian politics is Norman McLeod Rogers's *Mackenzie King* (Toronto, George N. Morang, 1935, pp. xii, 212, $1.50). It is a revised and extended edition of a biographical sketch by John Lewis, published in 1925.

The instructive experience of our neighbors in dealing with an important industrial problem is presented in *Canadian Anti-Trust Legislation* (Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins, 1934, pp. 105), by John Ball, jr., instructor in economics, the Catholic University of America.

Articles: William Bennett Munro, *The Fourteenth Colony* (Univ. Toronto Quar., July); Jean Elizabeth Lunn, *Agriculture and War in Canada, 1740–1760* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June); Hilda Neatby, *The Political Career of Adam Mabane* (*ibid.*); Lionel L. Laing, *Nova Scotia's Admiralty Court as a Problem of Colonial Administration* (*ibid.*); Ernest Scott, *The Canadian and United States Transported Prisoners of 1839* (Jour. Proc. Royal Australian Hist. Soc., XXI, no. 1).

Documents: R. A. Humphreys, ed., *Governor Murray's Views on the Plan of 1764 for the Management of Indian Affairs* (Canadian Hist. Rev., June).

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by R. G. Albion, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, J. C. Green, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, W. G. Leland, H. S. Lucas, Charles Moore, Stewart Mitchell, C. O. Paullin, Joseph Schafer, Preston Slosson, and L. D. Steefel.

PAGE

Freund, *The First Years of the American Newspaper*, by Richard E. Current 154
Curti, *Social Ideas of American Educators*, by Donald C. Knowlton 158
Stolz, *Die Verschiedenen Staaten; Unterschied; Die Aufgabe der Vereinigten Staaten zur Weltmacht*, by Carl Wittke 159
Savage, *United States and Mexican Controversy in War*, by James P. Baxter, 3d 161
Barnes, *Dunreith, Wild and Colonial Letters*, by Fred Landon 162
Freeman, *R. E. Lee*, III, IV, by Douglas Southall 164
McGrane, *Foreign Bondholders and American State Debts*, by E. L. Bogart 168
Hackett, *Fletcher's Tragedy*, II, by Arthur F. Wilmshurst 169
Williamson, *Edward Arlington*, by Wilson S. Clark 171
Howe, *Chester A. Arthur*, by Theodore Clarke Smith 172

Shorter Notices

Vincent, *Aids to Historical Research*; Gallenkamp, *The Eye of the Public Records*, by Elmer Johnson 173
International Bibliography of Historical Sciences, V, VII, by William H. Allison 174
Harmon, *Yale Classical Studies*, IV, by A. E. R. Boak 175
Monsiflano, *Claudius the Emperor and his Achievement*, by J. J. V. 176
Edwards, *et al.*, *Essays in Honour of James Tait*, by James F. Willard 177
Pleasant, *Développement de la peinture à l'huile dans l'école de Florence*, by Katherine Jeanne Gallagher 178
Lodge, Thornton, *English Constitutional Documents, 1307-1485*, by Edgar B. Graves 179
Constant, *The Reformation in England*, I, by Godfrey Davies 180
Knappen, *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, by H. R. Parker 181
Kernkamp, *De Handel op den Vijand, 1572-1609*, II, by Violet Barbour 182
Stokes, *Queen Mary's Grammar School*, I, by Thomas Woody 182
Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1722-1775, by Leonard W. Labaree 183
Rich, *The Staple Court Books of Bristol*, by N. S. B. Gras 184
Higham, *King James the Second*, by Basil Duke Henning 185
Hubert, Thuau, *Correspondance de Beaumelle*, II, by Mitchell B. Garrett 185
Palm, *Europa och Napoleon*, by Theodore Collier 186
Russell, *Freedom versus Organization*, by Robert C. Binkley 187
Lee, *Great Britain and the Cyprus Convention*, by Henry N. Howard 188
Overbeck, *et al.*, *Bibliographie*; Cayla-Rey, *La région industrielle amiénoise*; Florinsky, *The Soar Struggle*, by E. C. Hammond 189
Sharman, *Sun Yat-Sen*, by Cyrus H. Peake 190
Majumdar, *History of Political Thought*, I, by William B. Munro 191
Young Asia-Young, *Les relations de chasse Mandchoue*, by R. T. Pollard 192
Jane, *Documents Illustrating the Four Voyages of Columbus*, II, by Ernest W. Nelson 192
Wyllys, *Benjamin Franklin's Ethics*, by Lillian Estelle Parker 193
Lomax, *Washington, unabridged*, by Louis Martin Sears 194
Corwin, *The Twilight of the Supreme Court*, by Benjamin F. Wright, jr. 195
Goodman, *Benjamin Rush*, by John A. Krout 196
Fuess, *Amherst*, by J. T. Adams 197
Gambrell, *Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, by William C. Binkley 198
Brigance, *Jeremiah*, *Selections*, by Roy J. Honeywell 198
Gillett, *George Frisbie Hoar*, by George H. Haynes 199
The Economic Liberation of Latin America, by Hermann, *Brazil*, by Mary Wilhelmine Williams 200

This journal is not responsible for views of contributors or correspondents.

Entered as second-class matter January 20, 1916, at the post-office at Richmond, Va., under the act of March 3, 1879.

The
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
1917-1921

by William Henry Chamberlin

A GENERAL account of events in Russia from the overthrow of Tsarism to the [illegible] of the New Economic Policy and [illegible] Trotsky. Based on years of first-hand [illegible] Soviet records, the narrative is accompanied by texts of numerous historic documents selected with a view to illustrating the course of [illegible]. While a number of works dealing with various phases of the Soviet regime have appeared, no such general description as this [illegible] free from political or economic bias, [illegible] in any language.

The author, one of the most [illegible] foreign correspondents, went to Russia as [illegible] the Christian Science Monitor and [illegible] few months, lived there continuously [illegible]

In all bookstores

THE MACMILLAN [illegible]
60 Fifth Avenue